

An Admonitory
DISCOURSE
Concerning the
Late English Schism,
ADDRESS'D

To those of the Reformed, as well
as *Roman* Religion abroad :

Wherein the ancient RIGHTS of Bishops,
and their INDEPENDENCY of the
Secular Magistrate, are Asserted and Re-
commended.

*It will be reckon'd as no small Sin to us, if we should cast
off those that, Unblameably and Holily, bring us
the Benefits of the Episcopate.*

Clem. Rom. Ep. ad Co. N. 44.

By HENRY DODWELL, A. M. of Dublin.

Written originally in *Latin*, and now Faithfully
done into *English*,

L O N D O N:

Printed, And sold by J. Nutt, near Stationers-hall,
M DCC IV.



THE PREFACE.

THE Celebrated Author of this Tract, is so well known to the Learned World, and his Works have been so gratefully receiv'd by Men of Letters, that to give any other Account of Him, than what his Own Pen has done in its Admirable Productions, is acknowledged to be an Undertaking

The Preface.

too great for a Man of Common Abilities. Let it therefore suffice, that the Book, which is now submitted to the Reader's Perusal, has the Famous Mr. *Henry Dodwell* for its Author, a Person whom Two Universities Contend for, *Oxford* and *Dublin*; the Latter having given Him that Education which all Christendom stands instructed by; and the former prefer'd Him to its *History Professor's Post*, the Voluntary result of his unquestionable Merit, not of any previous Interest Whatsoever. But as Men of Tender Consciences Entertain more Scruples, than those that give a Loose to their Affections, and look no farther than the Majority of
Voices,

The Preface.

Voices, so it was his Misfortunes
(to give you his own Words)
not to comply with the Revolution which was brought about
by Divine Permission, in the
Year One Thousand Six
Hundred Eighty Nine, which
at length dispossest Him
of his Professor's Place,
with the rest of the depriv'd
Clergy and Layity. Not that
he, or his Brethren, malign'd
the Successful Attempts made
against Popery, by the Govern-
ment Newly Establish'd; but he
could not think it answerable,
either to GOD, or His Vice-
gerent, to Transubstantiate his
Obedience, and let it accord-
ing to the *Pythagorean System of*
Souls, transmigrate from one
Prince to another, while the

A 3 Right

The Preface.

Rightful Possessor of it (as He thought) was Living. In these Sentiments He has Faithfully continu'd to this Day, living Peaceably and Quietly, under an Establishment He could not subscribe to, while the Rest of the Bishops and Clergy for the Generality, either yielded up their Souls to G O D, that gave 'em, in the same Faith, or persever'd in preferring a Heavenly and Resing'd Temper of Mind, before Earthly Possessions. As these unfortunate Lords and Gentlemen were out-number'd by a Great Majority of those that took the Oaths to, and Recogniz'd the New Titles, as Lawful and Rightful; so it was not to be expected, but
each

The Preface.

each of 'em would maintain the Tenets, they adher'd to, and stand up in their several Vindications. Accordingly the Town was immediately full of Treatises concerning the Lawfulness, and Unlawfulness of the Government, then in Being. Among the Rest, our Learned Author was not Idle, but thinking it His Duty to Confirm the Gentlemen that seem'd to waver and halt between Two Opinions, in the same Sentiments, He himself was steadfast in; publish'd several Tracts, the Names of which I have not leave to set down in this Prefatory Account. But Arguments increasing on both sides, and the Different Members of the

The Preface.

same Church being equally charg'd with Schism, by their *Antagonists*, especially by the *Depriv'd* Clergy, who absented themselves from the Communion of those that *Comply'd*, He resolv'd to put an end to the Contraverſy, and close up the Dispute, by the Unanswerable Authorities that may be found in the Subsequent Discourse, which is Translated from the Original *Latin*; not upon any Account whatsoever, of Justifying Recusancy, or forwarding any ones standing out in their Refusal to acknowledge Her present Majesties Right and Title; but to let those into the Knowledge of the Arguments contain'd in it, that might possibly

The Preface.

bly be hid from 'em in the Language they were Written in, especially the Dissenters, who generally speaking, have not the same Advantages of Education with those belonging to the Church.

What remains for me to pre-mise is, That as the Book has been very acceptable to the Publick, from the Sale of it, in a Forreign Tongue, so it is to be hop'd it may plead for a Reception among *Englishmen*, in their own Native Language. If the Translator has not come up to the Beauties of the Original, and done that Justice to the Author, so difficult an Undertaking deserv'd, he has nothing to Urge in his Behalf, but that his Great Zeal
for

The Preface:

for the Propagation of sound Learning, and a deep Inspection into Ecclesiastical and Civil History, induc'd him to attempt this Version ; and that if he can but have Mr. *Dodwell's* Pardon, he stands secur'd of the Thanks of the *English* Reader.

und
tion
Hi-
this
but
lon,
the
Rea-

A T A B L E of what is contained
in the several *Sections*.

1. **T**HE common Interest of our Church, with those
abroad, reason sufficient to make them fear the
ill Consequences of our Example.
2. The Cause of the late Schism, by no means to be impu-
ted to the Bishops.
3. Wholly owing to our Adversaries, who substituted succes-
sors into the Sees of the Bishops, who were only deprived
by the late Power.
4. Our Behaviour to be judged by the Doctrine of the Pri-
mitive Church.
5. And not by the Prejudices and receiv'd Opinions of the
modern Churches.
6. The Apostles in the Christian Clergy of Jerusalem,
exactly answer'd the High Priests in the Jewish Sanedrim,
The Reason why Christians of the same Order, went by
another Name.
7. The Kinsmen of our Lord had the first place in the
College of Apostles.
8. From the second College of the Christian Presbyters of
Jerusalem, other Churches took the like Pattern.

9. Hence

A T A B L E

9. Hence it follows, that in the first age of this Apostles, all Christian Churches were Subject to that of Jerusalem.
10. During this space, the Church of Jerusalem, and its Itinerary Ministers looked after the Discipline of the whole Church.
11. The Bishop of Jerusalem, the Principle of Catholick Unity.
12. This Primacy of the Church of Jerusalem, seems to have been known in the very next age after the Apostles.
13. The Constitution of the Modern Church-Government altho' it flowed from the Apostles, yet 'tis younger than, any of the Writings of the New Testament, and therefore not to be expected there.
14. 'Tis not necessary that the Form of Church-Government, now to be observ'd, should be expressly laid down in the Holy Scriptures.
15. The Race of our Lord and David extinct, A. D. 107, or rather perhaps 105, or 104.
16. Bishops succeeded in the several Churches equal to the Bishop of Jerusalem, when that See flourished.
17. And that according to the Will of our Lord, and his Apostles.
18. The first Bishops had their Power given them by the Apostles, but not such a one as excused them from their Obedience due to the Apostles.
19. After Simeon's Martyrdom, the Apostolical College was at Ephesus, where St. John the Apostle was President.
20. From that time the primacy translated from the Church of Jerusalem, to that of Ephesus.
21. By this Apostolical College of Ephesus, the new-ordain'd call'd Bishops, and invested with a new Power.
22. And

A T A B L E.

22. *And yet this new Title of Bishop did not exempt 'em from being Subject to the Apostles.*
23. *The Episcopate established by the College of Ephesus, about the Year 106, before the Canon of the Gospel was confirmed by them.*
24. *The Martyrdom of Ignatius, A. D. 112, or 114.*
25. *The Writings of Ignatius suited to this time. No mention in him of the Church of Jerusalem, which was now destroy'd. His Commendation of the Episcopate, then very seasonable.*
26. *Ignatius writes so, as if he had before his Eyes, what we have been talking of.*
27. *Why together with the Power, the Name likewise of Bishop was so soon received in the chief Seats better accounted for by our Hypothesis, than by that affectation of the first place, to which the Presbyterians ascribe it.*
28. *The Name of Bishop in its primary signification proper to GOD, from thence transfer'd.*
29. *Ignatius says the same, and the Holy Scriptures before him.*
30. *The Apostles and Presbyters of forreign Churches, tho' invested with no coercive power, call'd Bishops, because they supervised the Distribution of Alms, that were consecrated to GOD.*
31. *The Name of Bishop, as taken for the Principle of Unity perhaps applied to any but the προωκεῖν ποι, but after the Apostles justly asserted to them.*
32. *This Connexion of the visible Bishops with the invisible one, the reason why the Sentences of particular Bishops,*

A T A B L E.

Bishops, either gave, or took away the Right of Universal Communion.

33. *What Ignatius meant by the Catholick Church.*
34. *Particular Churches may like wise be call'd Catholick, as they keep a Fellowship with the Heavenly Church of the Apostles ; but not such as have changed the Monarchical Government of the several Churches.*
35. *St. Cyprian's words are explained, concerning one Church, one Bishop, one Episcopate, a Portion whereof was possessed in full by every Bishop.*
36. *How it came about that the Bishops made up a peculiar College among themselves.*
37. *And justly, according to the reasonings of that Age.*
38. *The aforesaid Form of Government was most useful for uniting Churches.*
39. *As also for establishing the Concord of different Churches with one another.*
40. *The imparity of Bishops, that happen'd afterwards, to be ascribed to the Compacts of the Bishops among themselves.*
41. *The Right of substituting Bishops into the Vacant Sees belong'd not to the Presbytery, but to the Bishops of the Provincial College.*
42. *In case of Sacrifices, Heresy, or Schism, no need of any deposing. In these first times no Sentences past against Bishops, which might seem to argue a Superior power over them.*

43. *The*

A T A B L E

43. The Primacy of the Pope, either from the City, or St. Peter, none at all. The Obligation of General Synods none till they are received. What Provincial Synods, and how far they re to be approved.
44. The Power of Bishops in their several Churches of much greater importance than is commonly believed.
45. An Exhortation to those of the Reformed Churches to restore Episcopacy.
46. The Pretensions of the Papal See, directly opposite to the Primitive Rights of Bishops.
47. 'Tis certain this Primacy is no Article of Faith.
48. That Unity of the Catholic Church is very uncertain, which depends upon the Bishop of one Church, as the Head of all the rest.
49. The parity of Bishops, more for the public Good of the Church, than if the Bishop of Rome had been the only Heir of the Bishop of Jerusalem.
50. Princes have no Right over the Bishops in Spirituals.
51. There is no Reason why either the Reformed or the Romanists abroad, should overmuch confide in Princes.
52. It plainly tends to the destruction of the Church to allow Princes a Power to deprive the Bishops of their Spiritual Office.
53. Princes act against their own Interest, when they offer violence to Religion.

54. 'Twould

43. The

A T A B L E

54. 'Twould be to the common Interest of the Reformation, if the Bishops were restored to their Primitive Rights.
55. The restoring of these Primitive Rights of the Bishops will pave the way to an Union with the more moderate Romanists.
56. The protection of the Prince, no advantage even to the Roman Church, if he violates the Liberties of his own National Church, which he defends against the Pope.
57. The Primitive respects paid to the Bishops, ought to be inserted into the modern Catechisms.
-

To all Bishops, and other Governours of the Church, whether Reform'd or Popish, that are zealous for Catholic Peace, and the Primitive Church.

Right Reverend,

YOU will undoubtedly lament our Condition, and that not without just reason, when fame shall inform you of the Schism, wherewith the *British Churches* are at present torn asunder; but you will find a much greater Cause to lament, when you shall understand the reason which alienates us, tho' most unwillingly, from our dearest Bowels in *Christ*, from our Fathers and Brethren, so nearly bound to us in Christian affinity, and which hinders the most dutiful respecters of the Clergy, from Communicating with them. The Cause we are now embark'd in, is in our Opinion the very cause of Peace and Concord. Therefore that we may obtain a solid Peace, we find our selves oblig'd to refuse a temporary deceitful

L.
The common Interest of our Church with those abroad, reason sufficient to make them fear the ill Consequences of our Example.

B

one,

one, and are forc'd to keep up an unhappy Disunion, till a firm and durable Concord, agreeable to the Principles of Christianity, shall be granted us. Now if this is the true State of our Case, you are no less concern'd than we; for which Reason, we beseech you so far to lend us your Compassion, as to consider whether this pernicious Presedent may not affect your selves, and make your Unity and Communion precarious, and of no longer Duration than the Secular Magistrate shall think fit; especially since the generality of Laymen are so inclin'd to Libertinism, and even when the very Vitals of Religion are struck at, as unconcern'd and secure, as if no danger threatned her; neither will you suffer it to be in the Power of such Men, whether you shall keep up the Face of a Church or no, if they shall judge it convenient to maintain and espouse a Communion different from that which is truly Orthodox.

II. We may safely affirm, that in this strange Revolution of our Affairs, we have shown our selves desirous of preserving the Unity of the Church, as far as our Consciences wou'd give us leave. And tho' we have religiously observ'd the Allegiance we swore to the Crown, yet this did not hinder us from Communicating with those who had violated it. While the Rights of our Church and Bishops were not invaded, our Communion still continued upon the old Foot, neither did we set up private Meetings, different from the public, even to Worship GOD in.

We

*The Cause
of the late
Schism by
no means
to be impu-
ted to our
Bishops.*

We v
of our
our
and
was c
us in
while
posse
assen
the
selve
occa
Law
altho
Libe
we f
our
selv
our
adv
tors
inc
whi
tion
we
not
ou
fo
thi
fur
a S
Ca
Ep
th
th

We were not moved at the general defection of our Brethren from the received Doctrines of our Church, concerning passive Obedience, and Non-resistance; whatever pretence there was of taking up Arms. The Scandal given us in the public Prayers did not affect us, while no conditions of Communion were imposed upon us, that obliged us to give our assent to them. We were not concern'd at the Calumnies these Jurors drew upon themselves, being satisfied we our selves gave no occasion for them. The Severity of the new Laws enacted against us, as little disturbed us, altho' they deprived us of our Rights and Liberties, for no other reason, but because we strictly adhered to the old Constitution of our Country. Thus we did not suffer our selves to be seduced from our Duty, either by our own Passions, the provocations of the adverse party, and Cruelty of our Persecutors. We patiently endured whatever only incommoded our Bodies and Fortunes, and while we thought there were hopes of Salvation in the Communion of our Adversaries, we quietly continued in it. And as we did not depart from it our selves, so neither did our faithful Bishops command us to leave it. so far were they from enjoyning us any such thing, that they did nothing that might furnish us with the least pretence of making a Separation. There were no Ecclesiastical Censures fulminated against Revolters; no Episcopal Deprivations issued out against those that had fallen from the Doctrine of the Church; nay, they did not exert their

Authority against the very Subverters of the Church, and its Rights. Thus 'tis plain the Separation was made without the least concurrence of the Bishops.

III. But this admirable patience and temper of our Prelates, had no other effect upon our Adversaries, than to make them despise it; and those very Men, who by the Holy Canons of the Church were most liable to Ecclesiastical Censure, were the first that began it. Nor did they stop here: Lay Judges took upon them to pass Ecclesiastical Censures; and such as had never taken the most inferiour Orders of the Church, presumed to deprive the Bishops of theirs. A Decree was made by a Senate of Laymen, that the Bishops, who refused to take the new Oaths, shou'd be ejected out of their places. The time for taking them being expired, and these Fathers refusing them, they are deprived of their Palaces, Revenues, in short, of all the Rights annexed to their Episcopal Office. Hitherto we complained not of an Example, which in time, perhaps, may prove injurious to you. Let the secular Hand re-assume, if it pleases, what it has bestow'd upon the Church. This may hurt the temporal Estates of the Bishops, but can never affect the Consciences of Subjects; for Christ has laid no Obligation upon us, to assert the Legal Rights of Bishops, in opposition to the Magistrate; but certainly he has obliged us to assert those Rights, which he himself bestow'd upon the Church, in order to preserve it under Persecution; and which no earthly Power ever gave,

III.
Wholly
owing to
our Adver-
saries, who
substituted
Successors
into the Sees
of the Bi-
shops, who
were only
deprived by
the Lay Po-
wer.

gave, or was able to give. And yet the violence of our Adversaries proceeded so far! Our Reverend Fathers were driven at last from the very cure of Souls; Altars opposite to theirs erected, and Bishops of an adverse party, thrust into their places. Tho they were alive, their Seats were filled, and fill'd by Collegues, before they were vacant, before their Predecessors were deprived of Episcopal Power by Bishops, who had authority to do it, and indeed, were not removed by any Power whose Sentence was to be ratified in Heaven, lest GOD shou'd own those for rightful Bishops, who were only expell'd by humane Violence. Upon this Account we looked upon the Obedience we ow'd them to be still vali'd, nor cou'd we transfer it to their Successors who had departed from Catholic Unity, from Christ himself, and all his Benefits, according to the Doctrine of St. Cyprian's age. We found our selves therefore reduced to this necessity, that if we had any regard for the Salvation of our Souls, we cou'd not keep our ancient Communion with our former Fathers and Brethren; but on the other Hand, ought rather to break it off, since GOD is to be preferr'd to all Fathers and Brethren whatever.

And now, most worthy Arbitrators, we appeal to your Judgment, whether we have done any thing which can in the least seem repugnant to the Spirit of Peace and Unity? But we appeal to you upon this Condition, That you really be, what we suppose you are, true Lovers of the Catholic Peace, and Pri-

IV.

Our Be-
haviour to
be judged by
the Doctrine
of the Pri-
mitive
Church.

mitive Church ; and that you square your selves by that Rule of Catholic Peace, which the Primitive Church followed, for the due respect whereof, we so admire and reverence you. Nor indeed have we any reason to fear that you, being our Judges, shou'd think these Laws of Arbitration, we here propose, too severe and rigid ; for they are of that weighty importance, that if you pass Sentence, you must conclude them necessary for the finding out of a fit Judge of Peace. You cannot approve of any other Peace in particular Churches, than what contributes to that of the whole Catholic Church ; neither will you think it worth your while to listen to any other Umpire concerning this Peace, than the Catholic, and Primitive Church. To deal plainly with you, only that Reformation among you, can be esteem'd true and justifiable, which tries the errors of the Church in later Ages, by the Touchstone of that Church, which we are sure was the purest of all : And you cannot but acknowledge the Primitive Church, which we have chosen for our Judge, to have been the purest ; at least, you have the greatest certainty of her purity. 'Tis true, Churches of a younger Date may be pure, but 'twas impossible the Primitive Church should be other than so, especially while she agreed with her self in the belief of those Traditions she received from the Apostles. The Arguments of *Irenaeus*, *Tertullian*, and *Vincentius Lirinensis* centre here, which are above all exception, since they appeal to that Primitive Antiquity, to which *Irenaeus* and

and *Tertullian* still refer themselves, and not to the middle, and lowest ages of the Church, by which the *Romanists*, who defend the Papal Usurpations, wou'd rather chuse to be judged. I will pass over here, what I have sufficiently discuss'd in another place, viz. my late *Dissertations upon Irenæus concerning the faith of the first Ages in deriving their Traditions*. Thus you see our Cause must be tried before other Judges than your selves, altho' you sincerely Respect and Honour that Antiquity which we are here commending; however we thought no Church so proper to decide and extinguish the late Controversies among us as the Primitive. She was averse to that bandying of Parties and Factions so predominant in these times, and came pure from Christ and his Apostles, and was such as GOD wou'd have her. Riches and secular Pride, the Seeds of all Mischiefs, has not as yet appeared, or had they appear'd never so plentifully, they cou'd not in so short a time so far corrupt the whole Church, that she cou'd consent to establish Errors. But the Severe Discipline of those ages, every where maintain'd and flourishing, is a plain Demonstration, that she was in an entire State of Health and Vigour. The same is evident by GOD's watchful care of her in all places, confirming the Discipline of his Church, by the most manifest Tokens of his presence. This likewise appears by the lively zeal of her Professors, which easily overcame, and triumph'd over all opposition from the World, the Flesh, the Devil, nay, and even

from the Secular Magistrate, tho' at the same they preserved all due Obedience to him, and a most Christian Temper of Mind. Even at this Day, those that disagree among themselves in other Points, consent to pay a due respect and honour to this Church, for which Reason 'tis the readiest Course can be proposed, that all Controversies shou'd be decided by her Arbitration, much rather I am sure, than by that of any modern Church, be she never so Famous. Now the easiest Method of procuring Catholick Peace is, That particular Churches shou'd make mutual Allowances to one another, for the sake of Peace, and That all should not be compell'd to submit to the Terms of any one particular Church: Nay, that on Church shou'd yield to another, but rather to her self, that she when pure, might serve as a Rule to her that is corrupted. And this wou'd soon be effected, if every Church took care to return to the Primitive State. Now no shame for past Mistakes, nor envy or emulation of any forreign Example ought to hinder the bringing about of so desired an end. And thus our modern Churches will return with all alacrity to that Primitive Concord of the Catholic Church, if they revive, and as it were recall from Banishment, those Doctrines, upon which that ancient Concord was built, and unanimously agree to throw off those Scandals which have lately arose, and are found so destructive to Peace,

Thus

Thus we have made bold to interpose V.
 these Cautions to you, which we suppose you'll *And not by*
 be so far from disregarding, that on the o- *the Prej-*
 ther hand you'll countenance them by your *dices and*
 own suffrage, especially if you prefer Primi- *received O-*
 tive Antiquity to whatever Prejudices you *pinions of*
 may have imbibed from any Faction or Party. *the Modern*
 Otherwise I confess there are Innovations *Churches.*
 now to be found in all Churches, which will
 soon turn the Reverence of Primitive Anti-
 quity out of doors, if they were once made
 a Standard by which we shou'd Govern our
 selves: Nay, we complain that 'tis along of
 these Innovations that that Unity of Catho-
 lic Communion, which so eminently flourish'd
 among the Primitive Christians, comes to be
 destroy'd. Upon this account we appeal to
 those Judges, who will allow their own Com-
 munion and Churches to be examin'd by the
 primitive Church, I mean in all things neces-
 sary for advancing and maintaining Catholic
 Peace and Unity. As for what relates to o-
 ther matters, we are of opinion that all con-
 temporary Churches were invested with a
 sufficient Right and Authority of their own
 in their own several Districts. Let us there-
 fore enquire what was that Unity of the Ca-
 tholic Church in those earliest and happiest
 times; as also upon what substantial Reasons
 'twas establish'd: By following this conduct,
 we shall best be able to discover whether we
 have acted any thing contrary to that Unity,
 and whether we have omitted any thing on
 our part that was necessary to preserve it.

Now

VI.
*The Apo-
 stles in the
 Christian
 Clergy of
 Jerusalem
 exactly an-
 swer'd the
 High
 Priests in
 the Jewish
 Sanhedrim.
 The Reason
 why Chri-
 stians of
 the same
 Order went
 by another
 name.*

Now there are two Intervals of the primitive Church which we are to distinguish with great caution, when we argue from thence to our own times: The first, when the Bishop of Jerusalem enjoy'd the Primacy of the Universal Catholic Church, directly answering to that which the Jewish High Priest of the Temple of Jerusalem chiefly exercised over the Synagogues of the Jews dispersed all over the World, as also answering to that which the Bishop of Rome claims over the whole Christian World. For we have elsewhere shovvn, that the Sacred Writers do so compare the Government of the Christian Church of Jerusalem vvith that of the Jewvish Temple there, that they exactly answer'd to one another, as far as the difference of Oeconomy wou'd permit. There were in the (a) *St. Mat.* Sanhedrim the Ἀρχιερεῖς and the (α) ἡγε-
 6. 26. 57, *Εμεστ*; the former in our opinion were the
 59. c. 27. High Priests and Expontifices, and the latter
 7, 12, 20, the Sagans or Vicars of the High Priests, who
 41. c. 28. had the Direction of the Public Worship
 11, 12. in the name of the Twelve Tribes. Nay, we
St. Mark read of the γένος Ἀρχιεργων, or Kindred of
 c. 14. 43, the High Priest, Acts 4. 6. for St. Luke shows
 53. c. 15. in the abovesited place, That only such
 1. 31. as were of Sacerdotal extraction had a
St. Luke Place in the Sanhedrim. Nor do the Evange-
 6. 22. 52, lists only, but *Iosephus* himself mention the
 66. c. 23. Ἀρχιερεῖς or High Priests that had a right to sit
 10. in that public Assembly. Now the (b) Apo-
 Acts c. 4. stles, who were Twelve in number like the
 5, 6. Tribes, did in the Christian Sanhedrim of Je-
 (b) Acts rusalem answer these. Perhaps the number
 c. 2. 4, 6, of
 22, 23.
 c. 16. 4.

of the *Archieratical* College among the *Jews* was the same, and the Example from thence might be derived to the Christians, but so that the first Twelve of the Sacerdotal Family were elected into the College. I am not at all concern'd that the *Rabbins* are of a different opinion, who understand little or nothing of the Apostolical times, and 'tis probable to me that St. James the President of the Christian College, had this in his eye when he inscribed his Epistle to the Twelve Tribes which were scatter'd abroad; because the High Priest of the *Jews* had the Names of all the Tribes written in his *Pectoral*; and if we may believe * *Epiphanius*, St. James himself * *Her. 29.* wore the Pontifical *Lamina* or Plate on his 4. and 78. Forehead. Why not then the *Pectoral* in ¹⁴ like manner? However this is certain, that he had so many Apostles for his Colleagues according to the number of the Tribes; so that every Tribe had a particular Apostle to represent them. This is the Reason perhaps why we read that the place of *Judas the Betrayer* was filled up, and not of the other Apostles who died afterward, and not only to fulfill the Prophecy of the Royal Psalmist mention'd by the Apostle, who advised that Election. Indeed the very number of the Tribes seem'd to countenance it, since two of them were reckon'd to *Joseph*; however upon no pretence whatever were they allowed to exceed Thirteen. But the Apostles differ'd from the *Jewish* High Priests in this respect, that tho' both of them were esteem'd for their Extraction and Birth, yet among the Christians, those

those possess'd the chief place, who were descended from the same Family with our Lord, altho' his own descent is not set down in any of the Genealogies of *Aaron's Race*, *ἀν γεναλογέμεν* ὁ ἐξ αὐτῶν, as the Author of the Epistle to the *Hebrews* has long ago observ'd, c. 7. v. 6, 13, 14. and this agreeably enough to the reasonings of that Age: For the Writers of the *New-Testament* account all Evangelical things to be *αἰώνια*, or *everlasting*, as *αἰώνιον εὐαγγέλιον*, *αἰώνιον διαθήκην*, &c. by the same manner of reasoning as made the *Platonists* believe that all the Celestial Originals were *αἰώνια*, but the Terrestrial Copies *καιρὰ*, or *temporary*, and such as wou'd have an end: For so does the Apostle oppose the *visible* and the *invisible*, 2 Cor. 4. v. 18. exactly after the same manner as the *Platonists* do, because the Primitive Christians were of opinion that all the external Symbols of the Law were fram'd in imitation of the Evangelical Originals, which had existed long before them in the Divine Decree, and therefore believed that a greater regard was to be had of an *Everlasting* than a *Temporary* Priest-hood. Now the same Apostle proves that an *Everlasting* Priesthood was plainly different from the Levitical, and that by Arguments deduced from the *Old Testament* it self. He likewise proves that this everlasting Priesthood better suits with our Lord than with the Levitical Governors of the Temple of Jerusalem. Nay, *Paul* himself ascribes an *Everlasting* and *Celestial* Priesthood to the *Lord*, following the same Hypothesis which

which the Apostles themselves were tinctured with before they embraced the Christian Faith: And therefore when they own'd our Lord Jesus Christ to be the λόγος, it was but reason they should likewise own him to be an Everlasting and Celestial High Priest. The Reasonings of the *New Testament* take this for granted all along, but especially those of the Author of the Epistle to the *Hebrews*. Upon this account it was, that under the Christian Dispensation these were to be invested with the High Priesthood, before those who cou'd only boast themselves to be descended from the High Priest's Family among the *Jews*. Now why this first College of the Church of *Jerusalem* did not bear the common name of 'Αρχιερεῖς or *High Priests*, after the manner of the *Archieratical College* of the *Jews*, is owing to the *Platonical* way of arguing so much used in that Age. The *Platonists* asserted that all Originals were only one; but that the Copies were many. And 'tis after this manner that the Author of the Epistle to the *Hebrews* argues all along: He proves the *Mosaical Priesthood* to have been Temporary by this very Argument, That they were many Priests, because they were not suffer'd to continue by reason of death, Ch. 7. 23. Now no succession or vicissitude can befall an Everlasting Priest, because he alone suffices for all Ages, the Son who is consecrated for evermore, Vers. 28. And therefore they acknowledged no Copartnership or Collegue in this Everlasting Priesthood, which might

rationally enough be acknowledged in the Jewish College, wherein the visible λόγος was never reckon'd, but which wholly consisted of Men partakers of the same Nature, who might therefore be very justly accounted Members of the same College. There was likewise another Reason according to the *Platonic* Hypothesis why the Originals were not reckon'd with the Copies, and that was, because they placed Truth only in the Originals; and therefore these Secondary Priests, compared with the Everlasting Priest, had not been accounted true Priests. There was no Reason therefore that they shou'd bear the same name, who had not the same thing signified by that name. And so since the visible λόγος himself was the first Collegue of the new Priesthood, it was but decent that the rest should abstain from this name, lest they should seem to challenge a parity from the Co-partnership of the λόγος. Upon which account they thought it fitting to bestow some modester name upon their College, which should rather intimate that they were the Ministers of Christ than his Collegues. Thus we see St. *Pant* uses the name of *Servant* and *Apostle* indifferently, as signifying the same thing. Thus St. *Jude* calls himself the Brother of *James*; but tho' he was truly related to our Lord, yet he calls himself not his Kinsman but *Servant*. Nay, * *Epiphanius* teaches us, that such as gather'd the Revenues of the Patriarchs were call'd their *Apostles*.
But

* *Hay.*
Ebion.

But because if compar'd with Christ they were not to be called Priests, yet it does not follow from thence that they were not really such; for the same Reason might be made use of against the Jewish Priests, who are nevertheless called Priests in the Holy Scriptures, as far as that name properly belongs to Men. Thus there is no reason why the Apostles shou'd not take the same course under the Christian Oeconomy, which the Levitical Priests did formerly under the Jewish, and confer all the Benefits of the Priesthood, although they forbore the name for the Reason above-mention'd. The same (a) Apostle tells us, that God alone is *Wise*; and yet he owns himself to have (b) *Wisdom*. The ancient Christians in (c) *Eusebius* would have none but Christ call'd a *Martyr*, yet that hinder'd them not from being call'd by the same name. Only God is (d) *Immortal*; yet humane Souls may in an inferior sense be likewise call'd *Immortal*. Such forms of expression are sometimes used and sometimes avoided, according to the capacity of the Hearers, and the decorum of the Speakers, and yet the Sentence in both places is consonant with it self. And thus the High Priests and Apostles, tho' going by different names, were certainly the same.

But since those that descended from the same Extraction with our Lord, were not enough to make up the number of the Apostles Twelve, 'twas necessary to take them

(a) *Rom.*
16. 27.
(b) *1 Cor.*
11. 6.
(c) *Hist.*
Eccles. 5.
Cap. 2.
(d) *1 Tim.*
6. 16.

VII.

The Kinsmen of our Lord had the first place in the College of Apostles.

them from elsewhere, in order to equal the number of the Tribes. Whether these last were of *Aaron's Race* or no, we find nothing in the Monuments of Antiquity by which we may determine the Question, but that they were all of Jewish extraction there is no reason for us to doubt, since before the *Affair of Cornelius*, it was not known whether any other than *Jews* were to be received into the new Peculium. Now it manifestly appears that the Kinsmen of our Lord possessed the first Rank among the Apostles. Thus *St. Paul*, when he Argues from the Authority of the Apostles, allows the first Rank to those that were the Brethren of the Lord. *Have we not power to lead a young Sister, a Wife, as well as other Apostles, and as the Brethren of the Lord, and Cephas?* 1 Cor. 9. 5. Unless I am mistaken, he means by his *other Apostles*, those of *Jerusalem*, as they are oppos'd to the *Apostles of the Gentiles*, to himself, and *Barnabas*. In like manner he appeals to the Authority of the Apostles, as the chief Judges of the Christian Doctrine, *Gal. c. 1. v. 17, and 19. and c. 2. v. 9.* where in the first place he sets down the Brethren of the Lord, and that before *Cephas*, who used to be reckon'd first of the other Apostles that were not Brethren; however he places him before *St. John*, *Gal. 2. 9.* whom he does the honour to reckon among the *Pillars of the Church*, because he was in a special manner beloved by our Lord. Thus 'tis manifest beyond all contradiction, that the same Apostle sets down *St. James*, vvhhen he

he was Bishop of *Jerusalem*, before *St. Peter*; *Gal. 2. 9.* and that he possess'd the first Rank, in the Council of *Jerusalem*, *St. Peter* himself not excepted. For *St. James* speaks last in that Assembly, and the Decree of the Council pass'd according to his Sentence, both which are undeniable Marks of one that presid'd in a publick Assembly, according to the *Roman* Customs prevailing in that Age. Lastly, 'tis evident that while any of our Lord's Family were remaining, they chose the Bishops of *Jerusalem* always from thence. There were Three Apostles whom *St. Paul* in the abovemention'd place of the *Galatians*, 2. 9. calls *Pillars*; for the eminent Rank which they held among the Apostles of their own Order. *Clemens Alexandrinus* affirms that our Lord trusted them with the *γνῶσις*, or Knowledge, as if he confid'd wholly in them, and by their means discover'd himself to the other Apostles; in like manner as the *Rabbins* pretend the Oral Tradition of the Law, to have descended from *Moses* to *Aaron*, from *Aaron* to the Sons of *Aaron*, and lastly from his Sons to the Great *Sanhedrim*. For this *γνῶσις* or Mystic meaning of the Law, which was to be imparted to none but to the Disciples of the first admission, exactly answer'd this Oral Tradition, and 'tis in this Sense that the truly Apostolical Author of the Epistle of *Barnabas* uses the Word. However this *γνῶσις* may perhaps more properly be referr'd to the Voice that was heard at the Transfiguration, for these Three were then present, and none but they, when this

Voice was heard. Thus we find St. Peter confirms his own Authority from hearing that Voice in the Holy Mount, 1 Pet. v. 1. 2 Pet. i. 17, 18. and likewise St. John his, in his first undoubted Epistle. *That which we have seen with our Eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled of the Word of Life. c. i. 1. c. 4. 14. which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us.* The same expressions he had used concerning the *Logos* in his Gospel, *The Word was with God. c. i. v. 1. and v. 4. In him was Life, and v. 14. And we beheld his Glory, the Glory as of the only begotten of the Father.* And thus we may see that this Tradition of Clemens is not wholly to be rejected, since these very Apostles, whom he mentions, insist so openly upon it; however 'twas necessary that our Lord shou'd communicate this *Word* to those Apostles, before his Resurrection, and not after it, as Clemens supposed. We find likewise in Clemens, that by the Suffrages of these Three Apostles, the Primacy was allow'd to St. James, that he might preside over the Apostolical Colledge. Now this James must certainly be a different Person from that James who was the Brother of St. John, and Son of Zebedee, since he was the Son of *Alphaeus*, or *Cleopas*. Thus we see, that in the Writings of that James, whose Epistle we have, there is not the least Footstep of those Words, which we have observ'd to be so plain and positive in the Writings of the other three Apostles; nay, the above-mention'd words of Clemens, manifestly show that

that *James* the Bishop of *Jerusalem* was not one of those Three, since he obtain'd that Honour by their Votes; however *Clemens* seems to have mistaken the meaning of those that acquainted him with this Tradition, since he makes *James* the *Just* one of these three, whom he afterwards affirms to have been Bishop of *Jerusalem*; for this Reason, as may be supposed, because in the Apostleship, there was so great a Regard had to Birth and Extraction. Nor did it happen otherwise in the next Election of *Simeon*, the Son of *Cleopas*, wherein * *Eusebius* makes mention of the Suffrages of the Apostles, the Disciples, and Kinsmen, from some Report or Tradition that was handed down to his Age. These two Elections so exactly agreeing with one another, leave us no room to think that any thing happen'd accidentally in either of them. Thus it appears, that the Kinsmen of our Lord, were the first of the Apostles; and they that fill'd the remaining Number of Twelve, were chosen, as I suppose, out of the Second Order of the Clergy of *Jerusalem*, who were reckon'd among the Common Order of the *Presbyters* or *Elders*. To this we may not improperly apply *St. Peter's* calling himself a *Fellow Elder of the Elders*; 1 *Ep. v. 1.* and *St. John's* giving himself the Name of *Elder*, in his Second and Third Epistle; if so be he was the same with the Apostle. 'Tis certain *St. Peter* has done it in that very Epistle, of which we never find that it was doubted by the Church, whether it was his or no.

*Hist.Eccle.
L. 3. C. 11.
Gr.

Now this still show'd the sincerity of that humility, wherein the Writers of those times so much delighted, that they profess'd themselves to be unworthy of the Apostleship, altho' they were the chief of the Apostles that were not Kinsmen ; for this Reason, because they were chosen into the Apostolical Office, out of the inferior Class of *Presbyters*, to which they had not been advanced, if among the Kinsmen there had been faithful Believers enough to have made up the Number Twelve. 'Tis a plain Case, we find nothing of this in the Epistles of *St. James* and *St. Jude*, who were both Apostles and Kinsmen. And this they did, while the Apostleship was respected with the highest Honour ; for so long as this Honour continued, and they lay under no necessity of extolling their Office, even the chief Apostles commended their modesty by professing themselves to be unworthy of so great an Honour, and avoided the envy of it, as much as in them lay. Thus *St. Paul* reckons himself the least of the Apostles, and not worthy to be call'd by the Name of Apostle, who in other places does not deny himself to be equal to the chiefest Apostles. Thus *St. Barnabas* his Co-part'ner in the Apostleship of the *Gentiles*, makes the Apostles *the most contemptible of Men*. Thus not only *St. Paul*, but the two Kinsmen-Apostles, *St. James* and *St. Jude*, whom we have already shown to have been the first of that Order, call themselves the *Servants* of our Lord, more frequently than *Apostles*. And herein they acted conformably to the
Example

Example and Precept of our Saviour, that they who were the Lords of all, shou'd, to show their Humility, call themselves the Servants of all. So this was the first College of the Christian Clergy of *Jerusalem*, which answer'd exactly to the chief Sacerdotal College of the *Jews*.

The Second College of the Church of *Jerusalem* went under the same Name as the Second College of the *Jewish Sanedrim*, I mean that of *Præ byters*. 'Tis probable that there were Twenty Four of them in this *Jewish* College, for the same Number of Elders in the *Apocalyps*, seem in my Opinion to allude to them. In that place the Church of *Jerusalem* is described, as it bore an exact resemblance to the *Sanedrim* there: Otherwise that Number has nothing so remarkable in it, as that we can draw any Conclusions from thence. Now the *Sanedrim* had the same Number of *Sacerdotal* as well as *Levitical* Families that paid their daily Attendance: And in these Families, no less than in those of the other Tribes, according to the ancient Patriarchal right, the eldest Born Sons of the chief Families always presided, who are called in the Holy Scriptures רִשֵׁי אֲבוֹת *i. e. Chiefs*. These, because they owed the first Rank to their Primogeniture, were therefore called *Πρεσβύτεροι*; for the *Hellenists* made use of this word to signify this Prerogative of Birth. Neither was it at all necessary, that one shou'd be well advanc'd in years to be a *Presbyter* of this sort; 'twas enough if he was the Heir, and consequently the first begotten

VIII.

*From the
Second Col-
lege of the
Christian
Presbyters of
Jerusalem,
other
Churches
took the like
Pattern.*

*i. e. Chiefs
of the
Fathers.*

Son of the oldest Family, and this might happen to such as were Boys; now because this Priviledge of Judicature was intirely owing to their Birth, therefore we find the Name of *Judge* and *Presbyter* signifie the same. Thus we read in the History of *Susanna*, v. 50. That *Daniel* the Young Man, when he was made a Judge, had the Honour of Eldership given him by G O D. After this Pattern therefore the Church of *Jerusalem* employ'd as many *Presbyters* as the *Sanedrim*, that they might answer the Number of the daily Services, and that the Church of *Jerusalem* might enjoy the same Privileges over the Churches abroad, as the *Sanedrim* there did over the Synagogues. Now from this Church, all other Churches abroad took their Pattern of *Presbyters*, and seem to have done it at the time when the Christians made a Separation from the *Jewish* Synagogues, and had particular Meetings of their own to celebrate the Divine Service; but how far this Separation was afterwards carry'd, the Reader may satisfie himself elsewhere. Now if this was the Original of the Christian *Presbyters*, 'tis certain there is no pretence left to *Lay-Elders* (such as our modern *Presbyterians* have devised) for these *episcopales*, or daily Services, were only perform'd by the Sacerdotal Families. I confess indeed that we find mention made of the People in the *Sanedrim* of *Jerusalem*, as the Scribes of the People, *St. Matt. c. 2. 4.* and the Elders of the People. *St. Matt. c. 26. v. 47. and c. 27. v. 1.* Nay, of the People it

De jure
Laicor. in
Sacerd.
Grot. c. 3.

self,
Luk
not
Israe
alon
and
Lay-
was,
the
Aut
than
Asse
their
Pres
diffe
The
Cro
a R
and
to
inde
so
Ecc
whe
Gol
hap
Pat
wer
Me
was
may
spe
prob
hav
et

self, as the Word is opposed to *Rulers*, St. Luke, c. 23. 13. But by $\lambda\alpha$'s there, we are not to understand the Commonalty of *Israel*, but only the *Levitical* Body, which alone was concern'd in those daily Services, and bore no manner of Resemblance to our Lay-Christians. But whatever this $\lambda\alpha$ was, 'tis certain they had no place in the Christian Councils of *Jerusalem*; for the Author of the *Apocalypse*, mentions no more than Twenty Four Elders in the Christian Assemblies, altho' the *Levites* likewise had their רשי אבות , and indeed those Christian *Presbyters*, in the *Apocalypse*, were wholly different from the *Presbyters* of the *Levites*. The former sit upon Thrones, adorn'd with Crowns, which are the undoubted Badges of a Royal Priesthood (for so 'tis usually call'd) and not of the *Levites*, whose Office it was to give their attendance, and wait; nor indeed was there any necessity to entertain so great a Number of Waiters in the Ecclesiastical Sacrifices of the Christians, wherein the everlasting Priesthood of the Gospel was employ'd. Besides, it might so happen that the Christians follow'd this Pattern of the *Jews*, as well in those Cities that were subject to the Metropolis, as in the Metropolitcal City it self. Now what this was, * *Josephus*, that excellent Historian, * *Jos. Ant.* may inform us, who introduces his Legislator, L. 4. Ch. speaking after this manner, *Let Seven Men of the best probity and diligence in the Execution of justice, have the Government of each City, and to those, let two Men be joyn'd to attend them of the Tribe*

of *Levi*, From this Passage we come to understand why the Evangelists some times call them *Ἀρχοντες*, *Rulers*, and sometimes *Πρεσβύτεροι*, *Elders*; so that we were in the right, when we affirm'd the *λαός*, *people*, as opposed to the *Ἀρχοντες*, to be meant of the Levitical Body; and lastly that these *Rulers* of Cities, upon whom the *Levites* attended, were no other than *Priests*. For we find in the * *Prophets*, that the *Levites* used to be consulted about the Law; and that there lay an Appeal from these Judges of Cities to the High Priest, the Prophet, and the Senate, *Josephus* expressly teaches us in the person of his Legislator in the place abovemention'd. *Let them send for Determination of Justice to the Holy City, and when the High Priest, the Prophet, and the Senate are assembled, let them judge according to equity.* So we read this place now; but by the 17th Chapter of *Deuteronomy*, v. 9, 12. it appears, that instead of *ἱερεῖς*, *Prophet*, we ought to read *Κριτής*, *Judge*, if he was a different person from the High Priest; otherwise I wou'd read *ὁ καὶ ἱερεὺς*, *who is likewise a Prophet*, and understand the Oracle of the High Priest by *Urim*. However, even in this Sense it will appear, that these Appeals were made from the Priests to the High Priest himself. Now these *Levites*, two of whom attended upon the Judges, were *ἱερογγραμμάταις*, or Holy Scribes, as the learned *Bernard* has shown upon this place of *Josephus*; neither were they, in my Opinion, different from the Scribes of the People, mention'd in the Holy Scriptures, as we have already observ'd.

Thus

* Jer. c. 18.
v. 18.
Ezek. 7. 6.
Hag. 2. 12.
Mal. 2. 6, 7.

Thus we shall come to know what were the Elders in every (a) Church, and in every (b) City, in (a) Acts. the History of the Apostles. 'Tis certain 14. 23. and that (c) Gaius, a Presbyter of Gidda, had a 20. 17. Deacon attending upon him, and nothing (b) Titus 1. 5. appears to the contrary, but that he might (c) Cyprian have two; and therefore I am of the Opi- Ep. 34. nion that the Seven Deacons, whom Cornelius Edit. Oxon affirms to have been in the Church of Rome, and the Canon of Neocæsarea in a (d) City, (d) Ep. ad of a pretty large extent, ought to be meant, of Fabium those Deacons, whose proper Office it was to Antio- wait upon the Bishop. For these were the chenum Eyes of the Bishop, and thus there were apud Euf. Seven Men about the Kings of Persia, who Hist. Eccl. were call'd the Eyes of the King. These 1. 6. c. 43. likewise answer'd the *Ministring Spirits*, who Gr. were also Seven in Number. However, I look upon these Attendants of the Bishops, to have been of a younger Date than these times, of which I am now Discour- sing.

Therefore, since these Colleges, both of IX. the Jewish, and Christian Clergy of Jerusalem Hence it follows that answer one another so exactly, we may easily in this first from thence conclude, that as all the Sy- Age of the nagogues of the Jews dispers'd over all the Apostles all the World were under the Jewish Clergy of Je- Christian Churches rusalem, so all the Christian Churches in the were Subject to that of Universe were Subject to the Christian to that of Clergy of the same City. We have already ob- Jerusalem. served that an Appeal lay from the Presbyters of the inferiour Cities (for so they are call'd in the *Old Testament*) to the High Priest and Sanedrim of Jerusalem: In like manner

we

we read that the Churches of *Antioch, Syria,* and *Cilicia* appeal'd to the Apostles, and Presbyters of the Church of *Jerusalem*: For the same Method of appealing, held on both sides, that the Metropolitan City had only the second College of Presbyters in common with the Colonies, but retain'd the first and supreme, as proper to it self. Therefore for the same Reason, by which the Presbyters of the Metropolitan City it self were obnoxious on both sides to the supreme Colledge, it was that the Presbyters of the respective Colonies (who certainly cou'd never be greater than the Metropolitan Presbyters) should be subject to the chief College of both Clergies of *Jerusalem*.

*Phil. Leg.
a. Cal. m.
p. 10. 31.
†Iren. adv.
Har. l. 3.
c. 12.

Agrippa, as we find in * *Philo*, was of Opinion that the City of *Jerusalem*, was the Metropolis of the *Jews*, living in what part of the World soever. And † *Irenaeus* advances the like Notion, concerning the same City, the Metropolis of all Christians. I will give you his own Words in the *Greek Catena*, out of *New-Colledge Library* in *Oxford*.

ἘΑΥΤΑΙ ΦΩΝΑΙ ΤΗΣ ἘΚΚΛΗΣΙΑΣ, &c. These were the Voices of that Church, from which every Church derives its beginning: These the Voices of the Metropolis of all the Citizens of the New Testament: These the Voices of the Apostles: These the Voices of the Disciples of our Lord, who were made truly perfect, after his Assumption, by the Spirit, and calling upon GOD, the Maker of the Heavens, Earth, and the Sea, who had been preached by the Prophets, and upon his Son, whom GOD anointed, and owning none besides,
For

For, then there was no *Valentinus* there, nor *Marcion*, nor any of the rest, who seduced their followers unto Error. How much greater and nobler are these Commendations, which this Apostolical Writer bestows upon the Church of *Jerusalem*, than what the *Romanists* have pretended to say in behalf of the boasted Superiority of the City of *Rome*. By the *Voices* of the Apostles he does not mean the decisive Sentence of the Church of *Rome*, wherein there was no College of Apostles ; but that of the Church of *Jerusalem*. He tells us, that this was the Church from which all other Churches derive their beginning, the Church of *Rome* it self not excepted, which is so much magnified and revered. He affirms that this was the common City of all the Citizens of the *New Testament*, in the same sense as *Agrippa* supposed *Jerusalem*, to be the common City of all the *Jews*. He calls it the Metropolis, so that consequently all other Christian Cities, even *Rome* it self, were only Colonies sprung from it, and therefore, no more to be believed, as to the Origine of Christianity, than Colonies are when any dispute happens about the Origine of a Metropolitan City. This, and not *Rome*, he assures us was the City, whose Citizens were to be reckon'd Citizens, not only of the *Old*, but the *New Testament*. He likewise speaks of an outward City of *Jerusalem*, intimating thereby, that all the Rights of Christianity were to be fetched from thence ; so that even the Christian City of *Rome* it self had no other power

Iren. 3.c.8.

power to make a Citizen of Christ, than Colonies have of bestowing this privilege upon such as are born in them, of being accounted Citizens of the Metropolitan City, and to enjoy all its Rights and Immunities. And this he does after the Platonic manner of arguing in the *New Testament*, so much then in Vogue. Nay, the Apostle of the *Gentiles*, describes the Rights of Christianity, under the Name of a *Polity*, and a *lasting City*.
 Gal. 4. 26. Neither does he mean any other City, but that of *Jerusalem*, which he acknowledges to be the *Mother of all Christians*. Thus we see that this Apostle, as well as *Agrippa*, and *St. Irenaus*, owns the Metropolitcal Right of that City. I am not Ignorant that this is to be understood of the *Heavenly Jerusalem* above, and yet this does not exclude the earthly *Jerusalem*, if we consider the Platonic way of reasoning so much used by the Apostles; for the Symbols even of the *Old Testament* were supposed so far to confer *Heavenly and Mystic Rights*, that whoever wanted those Symbols, was believed to have no right to the heavenly: And this manner of arguing was chiefly used by the Christians, who turn'd the Mystic reasonings of the *Jews*, to their own advantage. Thus the Names of those Persons that were enter'd into the Registers of the Church, were supposed to be written down in Heaven; Thus they who had partaken of the Eucharistical Bread, were reckon'd Partakers of that Bread which came down from Heaven; and those that kept up a Communion with the Apostles, obtain'd a Communion with the Father and Son; and in short, all

St. John 6.

6. v. 32, 33.

50.

1 John. 1.

3.

all the Mystic Rights belonging to it: For 'tis undeniably evident, that those frequent *Kαὶνοῖα* or *Communion*s, whereof we find so often mention in Coins, Inscriptions, and other Monuments of Antiquity, are to be refer'd to the Rights of Cities. And this Rule of arguing was so much in vogue, that on the other Hand they concluded that whoever were destitute of these exteriour Symbols, were upon that very Score rendered incapable of enjoying the mystic and heavenly Benefits, arising from them. Nay, the whole Discipline of the Church, which flourish'd at that Time, was built upon these Reasonings; for the true Reason why People fear'd the Censures of the Church, was because they belived there was no Mystic Communion without an Outward and Visible one. Thus our Lord himself teaches us, that those that are not regenerated by Baptism are to be shut out of the Kingdom of Heaven; and such as were forbidden the Eucharistical Bread, were supposed to have no hopes of tasting the Heavenly. They that embraced a different Communion from the Apostles, cou'd expect no Communion with the Father or Son: and St. *John* the Apostle, in his first Canonical Epistle, which I mention'd above, plainly intimates, that the contrary thereof is to be fear'd. And therefore, if we are to be govern'd by this Rule, the consequence is plain, that there is no hope for us, of obtaining the heavenly *Jerusalem*, but by the means of the terrestrial one. Thus, he who desired to be a Citizen of the Celestial City, cou'd not obtain

St. John c.
3. v. 2, 5.

obtain his Desire, before he had been admitted into the earthly one. I confess that the Apostle teaches us, *Gal. 4. 25.* that the *Jerusalem*, which *now is*, is not at all to be esteem'd; but he does not barely mean the Terrestrial one, which, as we have already, seen, was common to both Peculiums, but only that which had no right to the Heavenly *Jerusalem*, which rather boasted of *Abraham's* Flesh, than of his Faith, and consequently was a degenerate Off-spring. For this was the Plea of the *Jews*, those irreconcilable Enemies to the Name of Christ, which he here opposes; but he is so far from slighting and disregarding the City of the *New Peculium*, that on the other hand, he makes it absolutely necessary for obtaining the Rights of the Heavenly City. The same may be evidently gathered by the *symptomes*, or *grafting*, mention'd in *Rom. c. 9. v. 17, 19.* which makes us Partakers of the *Root and Fatness of the Natural Olive*; he means the Promises made to the Patriarchs, to all which, we who were sprung from the Wild Olive, had by our Original no manner of Title; for 'tis certain, that those Promises were made to the Seed of the Patriarchs: And therefore, to make us capable of enjoying that Privilege, 'twas necessary, that like Foreign Branches, we should be Ingrafted into their Trunk, that so we might be counted *Israelites*, and descended from the Race of the Patriarchs. And this was unquestionably true, according to this Hypothesis of ours; for the Church of *Jerusalem* was wholly composed

posed of *Jews*, who were *Israelites*, both by Faith and Descent, *Acts c. 2. v. 49. c. 3. v. 25.* and therefore since no admission to Salvation was allow'd to any other Churches, unless they were united into one Body and Stem with that of *Jerusalem*, in true property of Speech, this was rightly call'd an *ingrafting*; And this makes it plainly appear, why even the Apostle of the *Gentiles* always allows the first place to the *Jews*, when he comes to reckon up the Rights of the *Peculium*, and that not only because they were first to be call'd into the *Peculium*, but because that in the *New Peculium*, as it was now constituted, they were to be reckon'd first. For the *Gentiles* came to them and their City, and not the *Jews* to any City of the *Gentiles*. Lastly, From

hence we come to understand why * *Clemens Romanus* speaks always of the Ancestors of the *Jews* in such a manner, as if he himself had been descended from them; and yet his very Name sufficiently shows that he was a *Roman*, and a *Gentile*. Nay, the Words of *Clemens I p. ad Jacob.* pre-

fixed to the ipurious Works that go under his Name, declare him to have been a *Gentile*, for so he Reports that St. *Peter* spoke to him: *For thou art become through me, the first Fruits of the Nations that are to be saved.* Indeed, what some Fabulous Authors have written of his being related to the *Flavian Family* is little to be depended upon. But as he was a

Christian,

* Our Father *Jacob*. N. 4. After this place in *Deut.* His People *Jacob* became a Portion of the Lord, a little after follows, being therefore the Portion of the Holy, we will make, &c. N. 30. Our Father *Abraham*. N. 31.

Christian, he became a Citizen of *Jerusalem*, and had a common Original with those of that City.

X. Since this was therefore the true State of Affairs, we may easily infer, that during all this Interval, the Christians had only one Principle of Unity, the Bishop of *Jerusalem*, after the same manner as the *Jews*, tho' never so far distant from one another, had one Principle of Unity, viz. the *High Priest*, who perform'd all Religious Ceremonies in the Name of them all at *Jerusalem*. For all Churches did answer the Synagogues, which did not constitute intire Bodies by themselves, but only some smaller Portions of the City of *Jerusalem*; for there were abundance of Synagogues, even in *Jerusalem* it self, among which the Synagogues of Foreign Cities, at how great a distance soever separated from them, were reckon'd by a common right with the *Jerusalem* Synagogues; after the same Example, unless I am mistaken, which made *Augustus Caesar* divide all *Italy* into Fourteen Regions, according to the Number of Regions belonging to the City of *Rome*, with this Design perhaps, that hereby they should know in what Region of the City they were to give their Votes; for the *Italians* had long before been admitted to Vote in City Affairs, and *Suetonius* informs us, that *Augustus* had devised a New Method of Voting for the City Magistrates. Now the Christian Churches differed from the Synagogues in this Particular, that whereas the Colonies of the Church of

Jerusalem,

Sueton.
Aug. c. 46.

Jerusalem enjoy'd the Rights of the Temple, together with the particular Rights of the Synagogues; the Jewish Synagogues had no share at all in the Rights of the Temple: The reason of which Difference proceeded from the Nature of the Christian Eucharistical Sacrifice, which was tied to no certain place; and in this respect differ'd mightily from the example of the Jewish Sacrifice. Nay, even in the Right it self of the Eucharistical Sacrifice, the Church of *Jerusalem* seems to have enjoy'd some particular Prerogatives, at least for a time. 'Tis probable that the Power of the Ordinary Rectors in the Foreign Churches increased by little and little, and that perhaps by permission of the Church of *Jerusalem*; and this must have happen'd of necessity if the Angels in the *Apocalypse* were truly Bishops, of which I will give you my opinion hereafter. But in the Primitive times, scarce any other Persons exercised any power over the Churches, that were subject to the Church of *Jerusalem*, but the Ministers of the Church of *Jerusalem*, that were dispatched from thence on purpose to manage their Affairs in the remotest parts. St. *Justin* Dial. cum
the Martyr calls those that were sent *Tryph.*
from the Synagogues, Ἀνδρες ἐκλεκτοί, or *Chosen Men*; and in the *New Testament* we read of certain Ministers of the Church of *Jerusalem* that were ἐκλεκτοὶ καὶ δεσποῦντες αὐτοί, i. e. *Chosen*, and *Well-*
D approved.

approved. Now under this Class I don't only comprehend the Apostles, but also the Evangelists and all Itinerary Preachers of what kind soever, not affixed to any particular Church. It was but reasonable and just that all these should be Ministers of that Church, which alone had the Care of all other Churches: And to speak plainly, none but those in the Primitive times looked after the Discipline of other Churches, even after their separation from the Synagogues, at which time other Churches had their proper Presbyteries belonging to themselves, and that in every City, They were so far taken up in performing the publick Offices of Churches, that they supervised no part at all of Discipline or Government; neither do we any where read of any Presbyters deprived by these Presbyteries of Churches whensoever they deserved it, nor of any new ones substituted into the places of those that were dead; nor likewise of any one banish'd from Communion, nor restored to it by the Decree of these Presbyteries. The very History of the Apostles ascribes the Institution of the first Presbyteries to the Apostles: *Clemens Romanus*, an Apostolical Author, to the Apostles, and certain Men whom he calls ἐμὸν, who seem to be the same with those, who in another place are said to be ἐκ λόγων, as being accounted great and eminent, in opposition to those

Clem Rom.

Ep. ad Cor.

N. 42. 44.

of the lowest Rank, who were *ἐν ὧν λόγῳ, ὅτι ἐν ἀριθμῷ*, that is, *of no consideration or reckoning*. Now he expressly affirms, that all the Presbyters or Bishops of the Church of *Corinth* were made by one of these two. He does not mean all the Apostles, but only those by whom his own Church, in whose name he writes, viz. that of *Rome*, and that likewise to which he writes, viz. that of *Corinth*, was founded, namely *St. Peter*, and *St. Paul*. *St. Paul* himself owns that both of them were concern'd in planting the Church of *Corinth*, 1 Cor. I. 12. and the same is testified by *St. Clemens* himself; N. 27. Nay, *St. Clemens* affirms, that they joyntly labour'd even in the Church of *Rome*, whose silence, as it was believed, induced the Learned *Spanheim* to maintain the contrary Opinion, viz. That *St. Peter* had no hand at all in founding the Church of *Rome*; and yet in this Epistle *St. Clemens* himself affirms, that a great multitude of the Elect were gathered to two of the Apostles at least, *who suffering by many Stripes and Trials, through their zeal became a most eminent Testimony AMONG US*. N. 6. Now if the *Romans* that were gather'd by the Apostles suffer'd, what reason, I beseech you, have we to doubt, that the Apostles, to whom they were gather'd, Preach'd at *Rome*? For this very gathering, to the Apostles sufficiently shows that this Church was erected by them, as

we shall see below. I am sure that the Original of the Church of *Iconium* is described after this manner, *Acts 14. 4. The Multitude of the City was divided, and some were for the Jews, and some for the Apostles.* 'Tis true, *Junius*, who first publish'd the Epistle of *St. Clemens*, supplied the Name of *St. Peter*, the last Letters of whose Name were plainly to be seen in the Manuscript, but no one doubts but that this Supplement is right. And this helps us to understand the Words of *St. Clemens*, which the surly morose Censurer of this Apostolical Writer, cited by *Monsieur le Clerc*, did not understand, wherein he plainly intimates, that these same Apostles were equally Founders of his own Church, as also of that of *Corinth*; so then 'tis clear, *St. Clemens* meant that the first Presbyters of the Church of *Corinth* were instituted by the Apostles, *St. Peter* and *St. Paul*; however, with this qualification, that others who were substituted into the room of the Dead, were by no means to be insulted and despised by the *Schismatics*, as if they had obtain'd their Power, by an inferior Authority, than their Predecessors had done; for he expressly tells us, that the Apostles themselves, who were the Founders of that Church, foresaw the Contentions that would happen about the Episcopacy. For which reason, says he, foreseeing this perfectly before hand, they instituted Governors, and afterwards gave a supplemental Law, that when they should die, (he means not the Apostles, but the Presbyters that were instituted by the Apost-

Apostles) other well approved Men shou'd take up their Office. Now the drift of all his Discourse is, to show that the authority of the substituted Presbyters was equal to that of the first Presbyters, which had its Original from the same Apostles, for that they, when they first erected that Church, took care of the Succession, and prescribed the very same Rules to regulate it, by which it had been continued down to his own time; that consequently this very Authority of these eminent Men in substituting of successor, flow'd from the same Apostles, so that none but they had a Right to chuse them. Perhaps too, these *ελλογιται* were sent by these very Apostles, after they had left *Corinth*. Thus we find St. Paul left *Titus* at *Creet*, that he might ordain Elders in every City, *ὡς ἐγὼ σοι ἀνταρξαμην*, i. e. as I have appointed thee. Here we see the Power of appointing was proper to the Apostles, as *Ignatius* likewise affirms, who makes it entirely the same, as to the Succession of Government, as *Clemens Romanus* makes it; and therefore the Word *ἐπινομή* used by *Clemens*, whatever he might mean by it, must of necessity signify some such appointment or regulation of the Succession. 'Tis true indeed, he might perhaps mean an Inheritance by it, as also some precepts about substituting Heirs into the place of the deceased. But I am rather inclined to believe, that he meant the Second Orders, which the Apostles might leave behind them, relating to the Succession, as they were opposed to their first Precepts, at the first

first Foundation of that Church. He compares the care of the Apostles in establishing the Priesthood to that of *Moses*. He observes that *Moses* had provided for the Priesthood by διατεταγμένα ἐν ταῖς ἱεραῖς βίβλοις and νενομοθετημένα i. e. *By his Regulations and Laws set down in the Holy Bible*; and therefore we must pass the same Judgment upon these Regulations of the Apostles, who in this Case exercised that legislative Power and Authority, which they had over all Churches; and by this Construction, *St. Clemens*, will mean the same thing by ἐπινομή, which *Plato* did by ἐπινομῆς, viz, an additional or accessory Law to others already instituted, such as was that of *Deuteronomy* with *Moses*, which † *Philo* sometimes calls by the Name of ἐπινομῆς, as being an Addition to that of *Sinai*; for after the same manner was the Law, that regulated the Succession, added to that Law, by which the Church of *Corinth* had been founded, altho' I own it may be call'd ἐπινομή, in the same sense as we call the Gospel a new Law, because it is an Addition to that of *Moses*. 'Tis certain the word δαδῶκασιν, or gave, is a Law Term, as for instance, that Man is said *Legem dare*, who enjoyns any thing upon others, by his own Authority; and therefore this Law relating to the Succession, ought properly to be ascribed to the Apostles. So then in this Interpretation, the ἐμῶν γίμοι were the *Legates* or *Vicars* of the Apostles, and whatever they transacted is to be ascribed to the Apostles themselves,

† Phil. de
rer. div.
Hæred. p.
503. 515.
de Creat.
Princip. p.
724.

themselves, or at least of the Supreme College of
 the Apostles. Therefore 'tis probable they were
 Itinerary Preachers dispatched from *Jerusa-*
lem, to supervise their Affairs at *Corinth*,
 and consequently the same with the ἐκκλησίαι,
 for 'tis plain, that the Presbyters, be-
 longing to that Church, had not as yet a
 right to Substitute Successors into the places
 of the dead, nor yet to Excommunicate, or
 Absolve, or inflict Punishments for any
 irregularity. Otherwise, one can hardly
 imagine how such gross Disorders could have
 crept among the *Corinthians*, when St. Paul
 writ his Epistle to them; Neither had he
 advised them to Mourn, 1 Cor. 5. 2. that
 their incest might be taken away from among
 them; for the very mention of mourning,
 supposes that it was in the power of others
 to take it away; and 'tis more natural to
 believe that the Presbyters wou'd take it
 away, and that the Apostle wou'd exhort
 them to do it, if they had been invested
 with a sufficient power to have executed
 it. We find that † St. Cyprian, in the case
 of an obstinate Deacon, advises *Rogatianus*
 the Bishop to bring him to condign
 Punishment for that disrespect shown to his
 dignity. On the other Hand, the Apostle,
 here, in the Case of *Incest*, rather takes
 all the Discipline upon himself than the
 Presbyters. For I, says he, as absent in Body,
 but present in Spirit, have judged already, as
 tho' I were present, concerning him that hath so
 done this deed. In the Name of our Lord Jesus
 Christ, when ye are gathered together, and my
 Spirit,

† Epist. 3.
 Edit. Oxon

Spirit, with the Power of our Lord Jesus Christ, to deliver such a one unto Satan, for the destruction of the Flesh, &c. 1 Cor. c. 5. v. 3, 4, 5. Here he only enjoyns the Corinthians, to see the Sentence by himself decreed put in Execution. This he did in the Case of Excommunication, and so he did in that of Absolution. To whom ye forgive any thing, I forgive also: For if I forgive any thing, to whom I forgive it, for your sakes I forgive it, in the person of Christ, 2 Cor. c. 10. Neither does Clemens express himself otherwise. Writing to the same Corinthians. we read of no censures of Presbyters, denounced against such Schismatics as grew insolent and proud upon the pretence of spiritual Gifts; neither does Clemens seem to advise them any thing tending that way. In that Age, none but these Itinerary Legates of the Church of Jerusalem, threaten offenders with Ecclesiastical censures. St. Paul threatens the Rod, and so does St. John the Presbyter, if he is the same with the Apostle. 'Tis true, the Arguments by which Dionsys. Dionsysius of Alexandria proves the contrary, Alex. apud are not to be despised; perhaps he might Euseb. Hist belong to the Second Rank of the Jerusalem Eccl. 1. 7. Clergy, and therefore call'd himself Presbyter, to be distinguished from his Namesake, St. John the Apostle, and so might exercise this Power in the Name of the Church of Jerusalem. Clemens Alexandrinus tells us, that the same St. John, upon his return from Banishment, did regulate the Affairs of the Church, at the entreaty of those of Asia; in-
much

Dionsys.
Alex. apud
Euseb. Hist
Eccl. 1. 7.

much that in one place he made a Bishop, in another, κληρὸν τινα, one Clark, as I suppose it shou'd be translated, and whole Churches in a Third. He is said ἐκκλῆσια Ecclesias. i. c. *Harpeer.*
to constitute Churches. I can't tell whether *Ἀρεμὸν* *Vid. Mau.*
in using this Word, he might not allude to the *Ἀρεμὸν* of the *Lacedemonians*, who *et Vales.*
were Legates sent from *Sparta*, to the for- *in not*
reign Cities that belonged to the *Spartan* *Maussac.*
Jurisdiction, and exactly resembled the
Ἐπισκοποι of the *Athenians*, who were not
chosen by the Cities over which they pre-
sided, but were dispatched thither from
Athens. And indeed, *St. Peter* the Apostle,
has long ago observed that the *Hellenists*
call'd the *Apostleship*, by the Name of
ἐπισκοπή, or *Bishoprick*, *Acts* 1. 20, 25.
There is likewise another signification of the
Word, that agrees with the place well e-
nough, when it signifies the same with
μνησίε, i. e. a *Woer*, which may very pro-
perly be applied to the Office of an Apostle;
for after this manner does *St. Paul* deliver
himself: *I have espoused you to one Husband,*
that I may present you as a chaste Virgin to Christ,
2 Cor. 11. 2. Now I can assign no rea-
son what necessity there was that *St. John* the
Apostle shou'd be call'd to discharge this
trust, if the Presbyteries of every Church
had Authority sufficient to have per-
formed the same. If they had not a suffi-
cient Authority, 'tis highly probable that
those *Angels* of the Churches we read of in
the *Apocalypse*, were different from the Presby-
teries instituted in those places; for we
find

find they are invested with an absolute Power of Government: To them alone is ascribed all the Praise for Discipline, when it was strictly maintain'd, and they alone are upbraided with Neglect, when it came to be remiss. Both which they had been charg'd with undeservedly, if the Presbyteries of those places had enjoy'd any Power in common with them: Therefore perhaps they were Legates from *Jerusalem*, but Subject to the Apostles. We see that the Lord of these Angels, present in the midst of them, is represented under the Symbol of *Seven Stars*, after the same manner as we find the Consecrations of the Emperors represented in their Medals; if living, with Crowns pointed with Seven Rays; if dead, with the same Number of Stars. And therefore the Author of the *Apocalypse* represents the *Apotheosis*, or *Deifying* of our Lord, by that of the *Roman* Emperors; and consequently the Angels in the *Apocalypse*, who ran over the whole Earth, *Zach. 4. 10.* answer'd the *Seven Spirits*, that were the *Eyes of the Lord*; for in both places, there are also *Seven Candlesticks*; so that there is no room for us to doubt, but that as the Author of the *Revelations* borrow'd somethings out of *Daniel*, so he has at least borrow'd this out of *Zachariah*; and so these Angels were Rulers of Churches, not born in the place, but sent *Missionaries* from *Jerusalem*; for our Lord himself did not preach any where else, neither was his *Apotheosis*, after his Death, to be represented in any other place, but

but where he had suffer'd Death. Thus likewise St. Paul directs *Timothy* about ordaining of Bishops and Deacons, about receiving accusations against Presbyters, and a double honour due to those Presbyters that had govern'd well; and 'tis observable, he gives this Advice to none but him; which he wou'd never have done, had this been an Office which the Presbytery might have discharged. Now that his Office was not fix'd but itinerary, may be made appear by several Arguments: The Apostle himself testifies, *1 Tim. c. r. v. 3.* That he besought him to abide still at Ephesus; 'tis therefore plain he was an Itinerary, when he was besought. In the next place, his doing the Work of an Evangelist, *2 Tim. 4. 5.* is a convincing Proof. Besides, his frequent Journeys with St. Paul sufficiently show it, and his Name joyn'd to that of the Apostle, in the Inscriptions of the Two Epistles to the Thessalonians. In like manner, the same Apostle gives *Titus*, and him alone, Directions about ordaining Presbyters in every City of Crete, *Tit. 1. 5.* He expressly says that he left him there, that he might set in order the things that were wanting; he was therefore the Companion of the Apostle, when he was left there. Many other Passages evince him to have been the Companion of that Apostle, and no more confin'd to any one particular place, than the Apostle himself was. In like manner, *Diotrephes* seems to have been an Itinerary, who had Power to cast out of the

the Church, v. 10. All the Presbyters of the Church, who had Power to administer the Sacrament, must of Necessity have been subject to him ; and therefore if he had been a Presbyter, this affecter of Primacy must needs have been a $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\alpha\gamma\epsilon\gamma\mu\epsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$, or a first Chairman ; now one of that Character had no pretence at all to oppose himself to a Presbyter of *Jerusalem* ; tho' an Itinerary, who deriv'd his Authority from the same Church of *Jerusalem*, from which St. John the Presbyter himself derived his, might have a pretence to do it. However we have no reason to doubt, but that these Itineraries, that were sent by the Clergy of *Jerusalem*, were subject to the Clergy of both Colleges, as well *Apostles*, as *Presbyters*. Therefore the reason why St. John threatens *Diotrephes*, was, because, being sent by the Authority of the Clergy of *Jerusalem*, he behaved himself with less Submission and Respect towards him, who was a Member of that very Clergy, than he ought to have done. For this reason, as I am apt to conjecture, *Cajus*, to whom this Epistle is Written, was of Opinion that *Diotrephes* was rather to be neglected than St. John. This *Cajus* seems to have been a Presbyter of that Church over which *Diotrephes* presided, and appointed to entertain such as Travell'd that way, for the sake of Religion. The Occasion of writing this Epistle, unless I am mistaken, was, that St. John had given Symbols of hospitality to such Travellers, which

which *Cajus* accepted, and *Diotrephes* refused ; such a one in short was *Archippus* mention'd, *Col. 4. 17.* for the Apostle owns him to have been his *Fellow Soldier*, *Philem. v. 2.* that is to say, the Companion of his Travels, which he undertook for the sake of propagating the Gospel. The same Apostle, *1 Cor. 9. 7.* bestows the Name of *Warsfare*, upon Journeys of this Nature, where he discourses of *Military Provisions*, that were due upon that Account of *Warsfare*, and demands something of the like Nature, for his Preaching of the Gospel ; which he had improperly urged, if he had not looked upon the fatigues he underwent for the propagation of it to have been a sort of a *Warsfare*. Thus it appears, that in this first Interval at least, the whole Discipline of the Catholic Church, was administer'd by that of *Jerusalem* ; for so we read, that the *Sanedrim* of *Jerusalem* had power to turn out of the Synagogues but not the Chief Rulers of the Synagogues, of other Cities that were subject to the *Sanedrim*, without the approbation of the latter.

Therefore during this Space at least Christ himself was the Principal of the Unity of the Church, inasmuch as the Unity of the Old and new Age, took its beginning from him. For this Reason the Apostle, *Eph. 2. 19.* calls all Christians *Fellow-Citizens of the Saints*, by which word he means those whom St. Peter calls *the holy Men of God*, *2 Pet. 1. 21,*
Name

XI.

The Bishop of Jerusalem, the principal of Catholic Unity.

Namely such, as by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost had *prophefied Scriptures*, v. 20. Now since all those that Writ the Scriptures of both Covenants were Citizens of *Jerusalem*, there is no reason why we shou'd understand this to be said of any other City, but that of *Jerusalem*. Therefore it follows *you are built upon the Foundation of the Apostles* (the Ministers of the New Covenant) *and the Prophets* (of the Old) *Jesus Christ himself, being the chief Corner-Stone; in whom all the building fitly framed together groweth, unto a holy Temple in the Lord*, Eph. c. 2. v. 20, 21. The Temple alluded to here, as to the Mystic use of a Temple, must unquestionably be the same with that of *Jerusalem*; for at the time when the Apostle writ this, the *Peculiums* of both Covenants met in this Temple; for altho' the Christians separated from the Synagogues, yet they never departed from the use of the Temple. Therefore the Unity of the Christians consisted in this, that they grew up into a Body with the Citizens of *Jerusalem*, and into one Body with them who frequented the Temple Sacrifices, altho' such as were uncircumcised were not admitted into the Temple by the *Jewish Rulers* of it, until they had cut off their prepuce, and were likewise made *Profelytes of Justice*. Upon this Account, I suppose, the Primitive Christians call'd themselves *παροικῖται*, i. e. *Sojourners*, and *παρακλιμένοι*, i. e. *Strangers*, accommodating themselves to the

the *Hellenistical* stile of the *Jews* that were scatter'd abroad, while they themselves were banished from their Native City of *Jerusalem*. All which the *Jews* did certainly mean of the Terrestrial *Jerusalem*, and so consequently did the Apostles, who were themselves of *Jewish* extraction, and after the manner of their Nation had imbibed an early Affection for their Native Country. *Philo* often expresses himself in this sort, and so do the Martyrs, mention'd by *Eusebius*, in his Discourse of the Martyrs of *Palestine*, own *Jerusalem* to be their City, meaning the celestial one I confess; but to which there was no admission, but through the Terrestrial, at least, according to the Opinion of the old *Peculium*. Neither did they think themselves to partake of Christ the Principal of Unity, unless they own'd the Church of *Jerusalem* to be the chief of all other, and paid all due Submission to it. And indeed this was but necessary, while the Apostolical College was confin'd only to *Jerusalem*. 'Tis certain, beyond all doubt, that each of the Apostles had Power over all the foreign Churches; for Presbyteries were every where erected in these Foreign Churches by extraordinary Rulers; now the Holy Scripture it self owns that the Apostles were chief of them. But if all the Churches in the World were subject to each of the Apostles, much more necessary was it that they shou'd pay Obedience to the Apostolical College, to which every Apostle in particular was Subject, and much

much more to the President of this College, who was as well invested with all the Prerogatives of the first See, as of being the Principal of Unity. For as for this last Prerogative, which belonged to the President of the *Jewish Sanedrim*, the College of all the Apostles cou'd by no means challenge it in common to themselves. And indeed, during this interval of time, no one but the Bishop of *Jerusalem* cou'd represent our Lord as the Principal of Unity, and therefore all Schisms, in what part of the World soever they sprung up, dissolved all Communion with him.

XII.
This Pri-
macy of the
Church of
Jerusalem
seems to
have been
known in
the very next
Age after
the Apostles.

After this manner do the Writers, that lived next to these times, express themselves. We have the testimony of *Hegesippus*, That, to the times of *Trajan*, the Church continued a *Virgin*, pure, and uncorrupted. 'Tis true, he does not mention the Church of *Jerusalem* by name, which perhaps at that time was overwhelm'd in the ruins of that desolate City, at least for the greatest part, since *Epiphanius* tells us, there were only a few sorry Cottages remaining there. But for a short time the Christians of *Pella* made up one common Body with the Christians of *Jerusalem*, and indeed we may gather out of the aforesaid *Epiphanius*, that the first disorders of the Heterodox appear'd in *Peræa*, in which Province *Pella* was situate. Now both *Hegesippus* and *Epiphanius* were of Jewish Original; so that we have no rea-

son

son to suspect that they have asserted any thing which they did not take out of the Jewish Monuments of both places, that they knew to be genuine. 'Tis evident therefore, that from the State of the Church of *Jerusalem*, *Hegesippus* took his measures of the Catholick Church, which had been highly incongruous, if the Church of *Jerusalem* had not presided over the Catholick Church. And indeed *Hegesippus* himself owns, that this Authority of the Apostles, which wholly centred in the Church of *Jerusalem*, prevented the starting up of Heresies; for no sooner were they extinct, but the broachers of them publicly appear'd and scatter'd them abroad. And perhaps we may pertinently enough refer to this head, the $\pi \lambda \alpha \tau \chi \alpha \nu$, or the power withholding, 2 *Thess.* 2. 6. For after his $\alpha \phi \iota \gamma \iota \varsigma$ or departure, he foretells that ravenous wolves that wou'd not spare the flock wou'd enter in, *Acts* 20. 29. By which words 'tis probable he meant *Heretics*, who after his death, (for that may likewise be the meaning of the word $\alpha \phi \iota \gamma \iota \varsigma$) wou'd appear in publick, according to the opinion of *Hegesippus*. For this supreme Order of the Clergy of *Jerusalem* so dazzled the Eyes of the whole Christian World, and commanded so intire an obedience from them, that so soon as they had fulminated any new Heresie by their Decretory sentence, it cou'd find no refuge or harbour in any Church of the World so-

E

ever

ever. But in succeeding times, when the Churches were reduc'd to a Parity, 'tis natural to imagine it was much easier for them to disagree about confirming their Censures, than when all the rest of them believed that they were obliged to obey the voice of the Church of *Jerusalem* alone. And from hence afterwards arose that boldness, which confidently supposes the power of the Church of *Jerusalem* to have been such, as we have proved it to be. The same is countenanced by that Tradition, which was handed down to *Eusebius's* time concerning the Apostles, - and other Relations of our Lord, as well as his Disciples, how that they return'd from their Travels, which they had undertaken for the propagation of the Gospel, to constitute *Simcon*, the Son of *Cleopas*, Bishop of *Jerusalem*. And from hence we may conclude how highly they thought themselves interested that this See should be filled. For we don't find they ever concern'd themselves so far about any other See, that of *Rome* it self not excepted. We likewise may observe, that not even then, tho' it was so many years after the death of *St. Peter*, did this Supreme College of the Apostles think themselves released from that obligation which fixed and appropriated it to the Church of *Jerusalem*. Therefore tho' we shou'd grant that *St. Peter* enjoy'd some sort of a Primacy, whom nevertheless we have already proved

proved to have been under the Bishop of *Jerusalem*, yet his Succession in the Primacy, if there had been any, wou'd rather have returned to the Church of *Jerusalem* than that of *Rome*. But this by the by. That Writer in the Third Age, who under the Name and Person of *Clemens Romanus*, published the *Recognitions* and some other Suppositious Monuments, which are rather written in a Poetical than Historical Stile, was sensible of the Truth of what we have asserted. For he calls St. *James*, and not St. *Peter*, the Bishop of Bishops, after the Oriental manner, where it was the fashion to set off the Supreme Dignity with expressions of that sort. Thus the Descendants of *Asaces*, and *Tigranes*, call'd themselves *Kings of Kings*; thus likewise do the Holy Scriptures stile our Saviour *King of Kings*, and *Lord of Lords*; which our Poet in some sort imitated, when he bestow'd the above-mention'd Elogium upon our Lord's Successor. Afterwards, when the Primacy of the Church of *Jerusalem* was taken away, it looked odious and arrogant for one Bishop to lift himself up against his Collegues. *Tertullian*, by way of Irony, calls the Bishop of *Rome*, *Pontifex Maximus*, intimating thereby, that among Christian Pontiffs, one ought not to affect a Superiority over another. St. *Cyprian* in the Council of *Carthage* condemn'd this arrogance, and boldly affirms, that no Christian Bishop cou'd call himself *Bishop of Bishops*;

who is the rather to be heard in this case, because if by the constitution of the Catholick Church, it had been lawful for one Bishop to have assum'd such a Title, no one had been sooner Honoured with it than himself; for he was Metropolitan of the first Proconsular Province in *Afric*, and President of this Council. This very same spirit of Haughtiness and secular Pride was severely curbed by the Fathers of the *African* Church in the Fourth Century, who Decreed, That the Metropolitans of Provinces should only be called Bishops of the first Sees, with this design, as we may guess, lest they should be accounted Bishops of Suffragan Bishops. The Inscription of the Abridgement of this Council adds as follows: *To the Council which follows the Holy Jerusalem, the Mother Church of Christians, and the other Churches of Christ founded every where by the good Providence of God.* Therefore according to this Author, she was the Common Church of all Christians, and gave Laws to the rest that were Erected in all places by the Divine Providence. Neither does the Epistle prefix'd to the *Clementines* under the name of the same *Clemens*, and Translated by *Rufinus*, much disagree from this, that we may not suspect it to be owing to the Interpolations of later times. Now in the aforesaid *Clementines*, St. Peter in a certain Epistle so expresses himself, as if there were no other Bishop among Christians

tians but *St. James*; for he calls him *Lord*,
and Bishop of the Holy Church, not so much
 as mentioning the name of the City. And
 after the same manner does the most an-
 cient *Ebionite* Author, who certainly lived
 near these times, express himself. The
 aforesaid unknown Author acknowledges the
 Supremacy of *St. James*; for we find that
St. Peter, according to him, believed him-
 self obliged to give *St. James* an Account
 of what he had done, and order'd *Clement*
 to inform the aforesaid *James* of his Preach-
 ing, and the Administration of his Function.
 And of the same Opinion those Persons
 seem to have been, whcever they were,
 that first digested the Epistles into one
 Book, a little after the second Century.
 This is certainly the reason why they were
 placed in the same order wherein we now
 find them. The Epistle of *St. James* ap-
 pears first, in respect of that Primacy which
 we have proved him to have had over
 the Apostles, when he was placed in the
 See of *Jerusalem*. *St. Peter's* Epistles come
 next, who was reckon'd the chief of the
 Apostles that were not Kinsmen; and
 therefore is set down first, even when our
 Lord was alive. Nay, *St. Paul* himself,
 1 *Cor.* 9. 5. places him next to *St. James*,
 and those Apostles that were related to our
 Lord. And in the Third place the Epistles
 of that Apostle appear, who took his place
 in the first Ternary of the Apostles, which
 was the very same which his Epistles still

enjoy in the Book of Catholic Epistles, viz. the Third and Last. And according to this order, even St. Paul himself ranks them, Gal. 2. 9. where he calls them *Pillars of the Church of Jerusalem*, and *Apostolical College*. 'Tis true, Clemens of Alexandria neglected this Order, who however tells us, that these were in an eminent manner honoured by our Lord in the *Apostolat*, for that extraordinary Knowledge which he communicated to them, and not to the other Apostles. To this perhaps alludes, *that which we have heard, which we have seen, &c. of the Word of Life*, 1 John 1. 1. *and we show unto you that Eternal Life, which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us*, v. 2. agreeing with these passages of St. Peter, *were eye-witnesses of his Majesty*, 2 Pet. 1. 16. *and this voice we heard, &c. v. 18.* as if in like manner St. John also commended his *Apostolat* from the Transfiguration of our Lord, at which he was present, which is the *γνώσις*, or knowledge perhaps of which Clemens speaks. And 'tis not improbable this was the reason why Polycrates, who lived not long after him, ascribes the Sacerdotal *Lamina*, or *Golden Plate*, to this Apostle. Perhaps in the Archieratical College of the Sanedrim, there might be some distinguishing Marks and Badges belonging to the chief Priests of that College, at least in the Age of the Apostles, among which this Golden Plate was one; and if so, what shou'd hinder these three chief Apostles from wearing it? All these

Clem.
Alex. apud
Euseb. Hist.
Ecccl. l. 2.
c. 1.

And Euseb. Hist.
Ecccl. l. 5.
Gr.

these things put together clearly evince, that these three Apostles were honour'd with the first place among their Brethren, and that in the same order as I have already shewn. After the Apostles of the first Class, St. Jude follows, who although he belonged to the first Rank of the Kinsmen-Apostles, yet he was the first in no Rank; for the reasons we have already assigned. 'Tis true, he was of right to have been placed before John the Presbyter, unless People's doubting whether the Presbyter was a different Person from the Apostle, had occasion'd two doubtful Epistles to follow the first undoubted Epistle of that Apostle, lest they should be separated from the true situation of their Author. In short, I suspect that the inscription of these Epistles intimates the same; for to call them *Catholic*, is all one as if they were called *Apostolic*, or said to belong to those Apostles, of whom the College of Jerusalem was composed. This however is certain beyond all dispute, That the *Catholic* Faith was the same with the *Apostolic*; and it was call'd *Catholic*, when after the death of the Apostles it was to be gathered from the consent of the Churches founded by the Apostles; and, as 'tis commonly believed, derived its name from the Universal Consent of these Apostolical Churches. 'Tis evident that all that inquisition was made about no other Faith than that of the Apostles, after the jarring and different Traditions of the Heretics had render'd it dubious. And on the

other hand, because this Faith was *Apostolical*, it might therefore take the name of *Catholic*. If this were so, then all *Apostolic* things for the very same reason might be called *Catholic*, and consequently these Epistles, when once it was made appear that they were written by the Apostles of the College of *Jerusalem*, for this reason especially, that they might be distinguished by this Title from *St. Paul's* Epistles, who although he was an Apostle, yet he did not belong to the Apostolical College of *Jerusalem*. But 'twill be objected that some have given the name of *Catholic* to *St. Barnabas's* Epistle, although he was *St. Paul's* Colleague in the Apostolat. However this does not hinder, but that by some particular favour of the aforesaid College it might be honour'd with the name of *Catholic*. The Holy Scriptures of the *New Testament*, call the κηρυγμα, or *Preaching* of the Apostles, (for so the Writers of the second Century, from whom the word *Catholic* seems to have had its beginning, express themselves) the *Word of Life*. And the *Egyptian* Writers, who publish'd in that Century certain Doctrines, half *Platonic*, half *Egyptian*, under the name of *Hermes Trismegistus* make mention of a λογος καθολικος. But it makes more for our purpose perhaps, that those Officers of the *Roman Empire*, who gather'd the Revenues of the Exchequer, were as well call'd λογισται, i. e. *Rationales*, or *Accountants*, as *Catholic*. And *Epiphanius* describes the like Office of some *Apostoli* under the

the Jewish Patriarchs, who gather'd in their Revenues for them. Nor was this Employment or Office so very different from that of our Christian Apostles; for they were to take care of such Widows and Poor, as were maintain'd by the Alms of the Church, and consequently gathered these Alms, not only at *Jerusalem*, but in the Foreign Churches, after the example of the Jewish Sanedrim, to which the Synagogues of other Countries duly sent their Tenth for the support and maintenance of the Poor of *Jerusalem*. Nay, the Apostles of *Jerusalem* demanded these Alms in the nature of a Tribute belonging to them; and bargained with the Apostles of the Gentiles, that they should duly pay them every Year. To conclude, *Epiphanius* acknowledges the Primacy of the Church of *Jerusalem*, *Her. Lxx. N. 10. Fifteen Bishops*, says he, *at once were made of the Circumcision, and then it behoved the Bishops of the Circumcision, who were then in Jerusalem Governing the whole World, to follow these, and celebrate Easter with them, that there might become one Symphony, one Confession, and one perfect Feast.* Here we find he looks upon the whole World to be subject to the first Bishops of *Jerusalem*, especially while they were of Jewish extraction. For my part I am of opinion, that they cou'd challenge this no longer than while the last Apostle of our Lord's race was alive, who was the second Bishop of *Jerusalem*.

And

XIII.
*The Con-
 stitution of
 the modern
 Church
 Govern-
 ment, altho'
 it flowed
 from the
 Apostles,
 yet 'tis
 younger than
 any of the
 Writings of
 the New
 Testament
 and there-
 fore not to
 be expected
 there.*

And thus the aforesaid Right of the Church of *Jerusalem*, continu'd down to the time of *Trajan*, and the Martyrdom of *Simeon*, the Son of *Cleopas*, which was several Years after the Death of *St. Peter*, and after all the Canonical Works of the New Testament were Written; and yet our Adversaries expect that out of these very Writings, we shou'd be able to deduce a Form of Ecclesiastical Government, still to be observed. Well then, do they think the Primitive Superiority of the Church of *Jerusalem* is to be restor'd? Alas! 'tis long agoe since that Church, that once held the Primacy over others, has been buried and destroy'd. Nay, even all those pretences are destroy'd, by which she obtain'd the Pre-eminence over other Churches. There is no Church now extant in the World, wholly composed of *Jews*, in which that grafting of the *Gentiles*, such as *St. Paul* described it, can have place; much less is there any one which enjoys the common Metropolitcal Right of *Jews* and *Gentiles*. Together with the Apostles, perish'd the very Office of the Apostolat, for we read of none of them that had a Successor assign'd him, but only *Judas* the Betrayer. Lastly, under *Trajan*, the whole Race of our Lord was extinct, and when that was gone, the Church of *Jerusalem* had nothing left her now, to value her self upon, which other Churches cou'd not pretend to as well as she. To her succeed-
 ed under *Adrian*, a Church wholly composed
 of

of *Roman Gentiles*, who cou'd have no right over the City of *Rome*, out of which they originally came. What then is to be done? Must the Eccleasical Rights of all Cities, be at least restored, exactly as they enjoy'd them under the Primacy of the City of *Jerusalem*? But they had none in the first times of the Apostolic age, while the *Jews* and *Gentiles*, were knitting into one Body, while they Communicated together, both in the same Synagogues and Temple, and acknowledged the Authority of the *Jewish Sanedrim*. Afterwards indeed, by little and little, the Christians withdrew into separate Meetings; but so that they acknowledged no other Rulers to have any Power over them, but the extraordinary ones, and who were peculiar to that Age at least, and consequently cannot be restor'd in our times, altho' we never so much desired it. The only thing that remains is, that the Presbyteries be restored, invested with no coercive Power; by this Means the whole Discipline of the modern Churches will be struck dead at one Blow. Offenders may safely violate all Rules relating both to Faith and Manners, if neither the Church of *Jerusalem*, the President of all the rest, nor any other Church is invested with a sufficient Power to restrain the insolence of Delinquents. Had this happen'd in that Age, Christianity had been very short-lived, and hardly lasted a whole Century: For the Body of this new *Peculium* had been wholly dissolved, when
so

so many new Heresies and Schisms, and so many Scandals upon the Dissolution of Unity, presumed to appear in publick. And if the Body had been dissolved, the Religion it self must have follow'd of Course, and fallen a Sacrifice to the malice of its implacable Persecutors, the *Jews* and *Gentiles*, and those no less formidable Adversaries, the Apostate and Rebellious Christians. What *Tacitus*, upon a little Occasion, observ'd of the *Britains*, that while each of 'em were fighting, the whole were overcome, wou'd have been verified of the Church. Our Blessed Saviour made the same Remarks, about a House divided against it self, and the Kingdom of Satan, if it laboured under intestine Divisions. Now 'tis certain, that these very *Heresies* were confounded by the Church, that a very severe Discipline was revived, and that all the Apostolical Churches held together in Peace and Concord: But 'tis impossible that these Glorious things should have been brought about, unless the respective Churches, that were the Guardians of Faith and Discipline, had been endued with a more ample power than they enjoy'd while the Church of *Jerusalem* carried all before it. However the History of this new endowment, is not to be expected in the Writings of the *New Testament*, which had been written and published so many years before the Church of *Jerusalem* had fallen from its Primitive Jurisdiction.

And

And to deliver my thoughts freely, all that way of arguing is very precarious, which concludes that the whole System of Ecclesiastical Discipline hereafter to be received, is to be drawn out of the *New Testament*. There is not one place in any of those Writers, that openly professes it, or so treats of Church Government, as if either the Writer, or the Holy Ghost that directed him, intended to describe one form of Government, which should be a standing Rule to all Churches, and all succeeding Ages. These inspir'd Authors have nowhere expressly enough told us what a Change should happen in the Ecclesiastical Administration, when the Churches first departed from the Communion of the Synagogues; neither do they clearly enough show us what allowances were to be made to the personal Gifts of the Spirit; and how much again to places and Offices: They nowhere with a sufficient accuracy distinguish the extraordinary Officers of the Church, who were to expire that very Age, from the ordinary Ministers, whose Function was never to go out of Date, till the coming of Christ. As all these things were then known, so they suppose them as known; neither do they explain them for the sake of posterity, as if they had only had that Scheme in their Minds, which then obtained. They nowhere professedly describe the Offices themselves, either what they were, or how largely they extended; which however they ought

XIV.

'Tis not necessary that the Form of Church Government now to be observed, should be expressly laid down in the Holy Scriptures.

ought to have done, if they had prescribed a Form that should last for ever. Nay, the very History of the Apostles informs us, that all things were not revealed to them at once, but by degrees, and according to the exigence of Affairs. Before the Separation made from the Synagogues, the Apostles themselves seem to have known nothing, either relating to the Government, or the Separation it self. But when the *Jews* Blasphemed, and pursued the Christians with imprecations, and all that an unconquerable Malice cou'd Suggest to them, then, and not till then, did GOD reveal to them that it was necessary now to withdraw from their Assemblies; before which Time we have all imaginable reason to think that the Apostles abominated the very Thought of a Separation. They were not only *Jews* by Birth, but Zealous for their Law and their Country Customs, so that they did not divest themselves of these hereditary and confirm'd Affections at once, but by degrees. Had our Saviour communicated any Thing to them which had seem'd to have a tendency this way, 'twas to be fear'd that they wou'd sooner have revolted from him, than obey'd him. The Apostles did not believe the *Gentiles* were to be gather'd into the *New Peculium* without Circumcision; and particularly *St. Peter* himself was of that Belief, till the Holy Spirit revealed the contrary to him. Therefore our Lord proceeded warily, neither did he think it convenient to trust

new Wine into Old Bottles, nor while their Minds were thus alienated, to give them new Revelations of Facts, to which they had an intire abhorrance. And consequently there is no reason why we should suppose that they received open Revelations, concerning these Facts that were so odious to them, before the Facts themselves happen'd. Can we possibly doubt, that the full exclusion of the *Jews* from the *New Peculium*, and that the failure of our Lord's Race, and of the *Jewish Church*, which was composed of *Jews*, and upon that Account enjoy'd several Priviledges peculiar to it self, were matters of hard digestion to the chief Apostles, who boasted the same extraction with our Saviour? Therefore if these Facts were not to be revealed to them before they actually happen'd, it had been much more unseasonable to have set down in writing, so many years before the Destruction of *Jerusalem*, that Form of Government, which was to be observ'd through the whole Catholic Church, after the fall of the Church of *Jerusalem*: At least, if the Revelation had been so manifest, that it wou'd have unfolded the whole series of its Destruction to them, before it happen'd: But in the Affair we are now discoursing of, there is a particular reason, why it was not necessary that it shou'd be expressly set down in the Canonical Writings; for although they had made never so plain Mention of that species of Ecclesiastical Government that was for ever to be observed, yet that

Men-

Mention wou'd have made us no more certain of it, than we should have been of the Books that had mention'd it. But without any such particular Mention, we have at least as great, if not a greater certitude of that Government which the Apostles instituted in the Church, as we have of the Books they writ. For certainly, if we will be guided by reason, the veracity of the Books written by the Apostles, depends upon the Testimony of the Age that was next to them. 'Tis highly probable that the Canon was not so much as collected in the first Age, and therefore must be supported by the Testimony of the Second, when the Canon was first of all compiled, and saw the Light. But in the Second Age it was better known what sort of Government the Apostles left behind them in the Churches that were founded by them, than what Books they had Written. There cou'd be no other Witnesses of the Books, than only those that were upon the Spot, where the Apostles writ them; but several Churches, that had been erected by the Apostles, were competent Witnesses of the Government they established. The Witnesses of their Books must have been of an older date; to fetch down Traditions many Years before their Death. Now to deduce a Testimony of their Government from the remotest Time, required a lower age, and consequently afforded many more Witnesses; and as the Matter of Fact was more recent, this Evidence

evidence was much more certain, than any we can expect of their Books. Nay, in the very place and age, wherein their Books were written, the Government instituted by the Apostles, was much more notorious than the Books that were written by them. Their Government cou'd not but be taken Notice of by People, even when they were meditating upon other matters, and celebrated the Eucharist together; but their Books were only seen by those that inquired after them, and were their most intimate Friends, for others can hardly be supposed to have had any certainty about the Authors of those Books. Therefore, since an express mention of the Ecclesiastical Government in the Canonical Books, cou'd have added no new degree of certainty to it, there is no Reason why any prejudices should be form'd in detriment to its Right, merely because the Canonical Writers have taken no notice of it.

Let us therefore see, out of the later Monuments, what new Rights descended to the other Churches, upon the Destruction of that of Jerusalem, and upon what Account they obtain'd them. But that we may better understand the connexion of those Affairs that afterwards happen'd, 'twill not be amiss to examine the Time, wherein so great a Change was brought about, with a little more accuracy than hitherto has been used. I was formerly of the Opinion that *Simeon's* Death fell out in the Year of our Lord, 116. but am apt to believe now, that it is to be placed to the beginning of *Trajan's* Reign. † *Hegesippus* tells us, that two Nephews of St. Jude, who ran

XV.
The race of
our Lord
and David
extinct A.
D. 107,
or rather
perhaps 103
or 104.

† *Apud*
Euseb. Hist.
the *Ecc. l. 3.*

the risque of their lives under *Domitian*, because they were descended from *David's Race*, after the Peace was made, continu'd in this Life till *Trajan's Time*. This Peace happen'd under *Nerva*, when the exiles were re-call'd home; and therefore, when he affirms, that they reach'd *Trajan's Reign*, he means, that that Prince had not Reign'd long, when they died. One wou'd conclude from his way of expressing it, that both of them Died at one and the same Time. If this be so, 'tis most probable that they then Died, when to be descended from the *Davidical Line*, was Crime sufficient to bring them into Danger of their Lives, viz. At the same time when *Simeon*, Brother to the Grandfather of *Cleopas*, was taken off upon the same Pretence. Otherwise, 'twas no wonder if the Nephews of *St. Jude*, liv'd till the Time of *Trajan*, at which time they cou'd only write themselves young Men: For our Lord's Brothers, *St. James* and *St. Jude*, and *Simeon*, the Sons of *Mary*, the Daughter of *Cleopas*, Sister to the Blessed Virgin, were much of the same Age with them. And therefore these Nephews of *St. Jude* lived to the Third Generation after our Lord. The above mention'd *Hegesippus* testifies, that being dismissed by *Domitian*, they govern'd the Churches; because they were admitted into the Clergy of *Jerusalem*, which then presid'd over all Churches, and that upon a Two-fold Account; as *Martyrs*, and as descended from our Lord's Race. This last reason sufficiently shows that the Clergy, whereof their Family made them Partakers, cou'd be no other than that of *Jerusalem*; for

we have already proved that those of our Lord's Race were admitted into it ; but then it must have been the second Order of the Clergy, viz. That of the *Presbyters*, because their Age made them incapable of the Apostolat : And this happen'd many years after the Number of the Apostles was compleated, none of whom had a successor but Judas the Betrayer ; for 'tis plain by the first Reason, that they were receiv'd into the Clergy of Jerusalem, after they had been dismiss'd by Domitian. Now let us suppose, that at this time they were Thirty years old, (which Age the Levitical Law requires, as necessary for the Priesthood) then according to this computation, they cou'd not be past their Youth in the beginning of Trajan's Reign. Therefore Hegeſippus's meaning must be, that not their Age, but the Design then on Foot, to abolish the whole Race of David, was the reason why they did not out live Trajan. Nay, Hegeſippus's words concerning Simeon, intimate that they died for the same Account that Simeon did. In like manner, says he, he was accused before Atticus the Consul, for the same Reason. Who this Atticus was, does not appear, neither know we the precise time when he was Consul, or of the Consular rank : But 'tis probable the first Insurrections in the East, gave pretence sufficient to take them off, who had been long ago suspected under Domitian. These Commotions, unless I am mistaken, began in Arabia, and were suppressed by Palma, much about the Time that Trajan himself put an end to the Second Dacian War, viz. A.D. 107. The Author

of *St. Ignatius's* Martyrdom makes this Year, which was the Ninth of *Trajan*, famous for Persecution; this Emperour's late Victories over the *Dacians*, making him forget his former Moderation and Temper. And indeed, 'tis evident out of *Hegeſippus*, that *Simeon* suffer'd as well for our Saviour's Account, as the Score of his Family; for to what end were his Torments inflicted upon him, but to force him to deny Christ, and not only to punish his extraction from *David*? However, 'tis certain that *Ignatius* was not taken off in this Persecution, tho' the Author of his Martyrdom will needs have him suffer this Year, being led into this Mistake, I suppose, because he had heard this was a great Year for Persecution, particularly for that which dissolved the Primacy of *Jerusalem*, the Race of our Lord being now wholly exterminated: For this was one of the most remarkable *Epochs* in Ecclesiastical History; and if any, this certainly ought to be deliver'd to posterity by Christian Writers. *Eusebius* in his *Chronicon* places the Death of *Simeon*, the Son of *Cleopas*, towards the conclusion of the Tenth Year of *Trajan*; however, 'tis more probable that he suffer'd in the beginning of the War; for then was the proper Time to suppress the insolence of the *Jews*, in case they shou'd attempt any Thing against the Peace of the *Roman Empire*; unless the *Jews* discover'd their Hostile Intentions, not till after the War was actually broke out. But the Author of the *Chronicon Paschale* places the Martyrdom of *Simeon* up-

on Two years, viz. 104 and 105, being betray'd into this mistake, by his having two Names; for he affirms, that *Simeon* the *Canaanite* suffer'd in the foregoing, and *Simeon* the Son of *Cleopas*, in the succeeding Year. He was ignorant, it seems, that no Apostle could possibly be a *Canaanite*, who came from a different Race from that of the *Jews*. In other Manuscripts he is more rightly call'd *Καρυαίος*, which in the *Hebrew* signifies the same as *Ζηλωτής* does in the *Greek*; and in the next place, he was ignorant that *Simeon* the Son of *Cleopas*, was the same with *Zelotes*. Now his placing the same Martyrdom of the same individual Person upon two years, proceeded, unless I am mistaken, from the different placing of the same Consuls, *Candidus*, and *Quadratus*, in two different Consular Tables, I am of opinion that these Consuls are to be assign'd to the Year 104. tho' the common accounts place them to the year 105. So then all that the Compilers of this *Chronicon* took out of undoubted Memoirs is, that *Simeon* suffer'd Martyrdom when they were Consuls. Now it might happen so, that according to both Accounts his Passion fell out under their Consulat, viz. towards the end of the former, and beginning of the latter Year; for the first *Dacian* War begun towards the conclusion of the Year 100. But both the Wars lasted five Years, as *Julian* the Apostate informs us in his *Cæsars*. If in the fifth Year an end was put to the second War, and we suppose it was but only begun, then 'tis plain the War ended in the Year 104. But if both Wars took up five Years intirely, *Trajan*

reduced *Dacia* into the form of a Province rather in the Year 105. And therefore, if *Trajan*, being puff'd up with the victorious success of this War, began a Persecution, this Storm, so fatal to the Church of *Jerusalem*, may be properly enough placed in either Year.

But I think there's more Reason for placing it to the beginning of *Trajan's* Reign, that
Euseb. Hist. Eccl. l. 4. c. 5. so we may allow a larger Space to the Thirteen Bishops, who passed between this our Apostle *Simeon*, and the *Romans* who dwelt upon the Ruins of *Jerusalem* in the new Colony there that was call'd *Alia Capitolina*. Since *Eusebius* knew nothing of these times, we need not doubt but that whatever the Writers that came after him have related concerning them is wholly Fabulous and to be rejected. The many successors that we find in this Church, within so short a compass of time, sufficiently show, that it seldom enjoy'd any intervals of Peace, altho the Supputation were to begin from the Year we assign'd; so that it wou'd become less probable if it were to be shut up within narrower limits. 'Tis certain it must have an earlier beginning under *Trajan*, than the *Ebionians*, who started up after the Death of *Simeon*, might have time enough to make so great a progress as they did, as well in *Peræa* as in *Asia minor*; and that while *Trajan* was Emperor. It must likewise have begun earlier since *Irenæus*, who, was born *A. D.* 97, did not converse with the Apostles themselves, but only with their Auditors and Disciples; likewise since *Papias*, who was almost as old as *Polycarp*, the Disciple of *St. John* (the Presbyter, 'tis probable) the Companion of
Poly-

Polycarp, call'd an old Man even by *Irenaeus* himself, and who consequently was older than he, did not hear the chief Apostles, but only their Auditors. To conclude, it must have been earlier, since the Heretics, who wrote about the beginning of *Hadrian's* Reign, had by that time render'd the Tradition o' the Apostles uncertain and not to be confirm'd, but by long Voyages, and very ancient Witnesses. That this remarkable Destruction, happen'd at the same time, we may gather from hence, That about this juncture, the Christians undertook new Expeditions into *India*, newly conquer'd by *Palma*, being dispers'd by the very same Persecution, which extinguished the Family of our Lord. Thus the Persecution, under which *St. Stephen* suffer'd, proved a means of propagating the Gospel, *Acts* 8. 4. and the same appears by the Enquiry *Hegesippus* made into the Faith of the Apostles, by reason of some new Heresie started up under *Hadrian*, which had so far abused and mis-represented the Apostles, as to make them not only differ from themselves, but from one another; Tho' he was a Jew by Birth, yet he was not content with the bare Testimony of the Church of *Jerusalem*, since now she had lost all those particular Rights and Prerogatives, which when she enjoy'd, made her heard before all other Churches. Now he might have heard from some that were older than himself (if there were any such) what the Opinion of the Apostles was, and how far it agreed with it self: But no old Men of *Jerusalem*, are any where produced as Witnesses of the Apostolic Tradition against the Heretics. Nay, the Gentiles, by their

their most bloody and frequent Persecutions; one upon the neck of another, seem to have so intirely dissipated the Members of that Church, that it hardly kept up the Face of a Church: For *Eusebius* has only preserv'd the Names of the Bishops, but was wholly in the Dark as to their Actions. If Tradition may be relied upon, *St. Bartholomew* went into *India*. *Papias* seems to make *John* the Presbyter, and *Aristion*, not meet in *Jerusalem*, but *Asia minor*. If this were so, the Traditions of the Apostles were not to be learnt from the Apostolic Church it self, but from the Colonies which the Apostles planted else where. *Papias*, the oldest Searcher after Traditions, pretended to no Traditions from *Simeon*, but from some Apostles that were younger than he, altho' they died before him. He gather'd his Traditions when *Trajan* was Emperor, not at *Jerusalem*, but as 'tis more probable, in *Asia the Less*; Otherwise he had most infallibly made mention of *Simeon*, who was the Prince of the latter Apostles. But the Memory of the Church of *Jerusalem* cou'd hardly have been so totally effaced, when *Hegesippus* gather'd his Traditions under *Pius* the Emperor, if *Simeon* had lived till the end *Euseb. Hist. of Trajan's Reign.* *Hegesippus* came to Rome *Ecc. l. 4.* when *Anicetus* was Pontiff there, and *Pius* Bishop of *Corinth*, who was succeeded in that See, by *Dionysius*, a Contemporary of *Soter* the successor of *Anicetus*. I am apt to believe that the main reason why the *Gentiles* thunder'd so furiously upon the Church of *Jerusalem* was, that when the Head was once taken away, the fate of *Christianity* wou'd soon follow after. But God made the Event very much different from what they expected. For

For instead of onehead, viz. the Bishop of *Jerusalem*; there were afterwards as many heads in the Church as there were *Persons* *Seias*, or *Chief Sees*, of equal authority with him. The Church of *Jerusalem* had nothing now to boast off, by which she could pretend to any pre-eminence over other Churches: With the last Apostle, even the very Office of the Apostolat fail'd; for, as I have had occasion to observe; none of the Apostles had any Successors substituted into their Room, but only *Judas the Betrayer*. And so it fell out, that the Order of Presbyters (which heretofore was the second Rank in the Church of *Jerusalem*) was afterwards the first. Thus the Church of *Jerusalem* after this change had no order peculiar to itself; since all other Churches in the World had their own Presbyteries in every City. All that any of the Presbyters of that City; had now to value themselves upon, was to be perhaps related to our Lord: For the Holy Seed was much esteem'd by the new Peculium, as coming from a Holy People, but especially a *Hebrew of Hebrews*, who was born holy by both Parents, of which *St. Paul* boasts, *Phil. 3. 5.* The Sacerdotal Seed was yet holier than this, so that it was reckon'd an enormous Offence, if one of an other Tribe, nay, even that of *Levi* itself, was admitted into the Priesthood, if he was not descended from the Race of *Aaron*. But among Christians it was necessary, that the race of the Priesthood of *Melchisedeck*, to whom *Levi*

G

himself

XVI.
Bishops
Succeeded
in the
several
Churches
equal to the
Bishop of
Jerusalem,
when that
See flourish-
ed.

himself pay'd Tithes in *Abraham*, (as the Author of the Epistle to the *Hebrews* has observ'd, *Heb.* 7. 9.) should be more holy than *Aaron's* race : For after this manner does *St. Paul* Argue from the received Opinion concerning the Sanctity of Seed, 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. And from thence we may gather, that the Christians were not unacquainted with this way of Arguing, as is now commonly believ'd. We find the aforesaid Apostle boasts, that the Lord *was known to him according to the Flesh*, 2 *Cor.* 5. 16. and he looks upon it as a great Glory to the old Peculium, *that out of it, as concerning the Flesh, Christ came*, *Rom.* 9. 5. To these and the like Opinions we may ascribe it, that in all Churches, such as first embraced the Faith of Christ were reckon'd the first Fruits thereof, upon which account they were advanc'd to the Priesthood, as being holier than the rest : For the same reason, *Polycrates* boasts, that he was the Eighth Person of his Family, who had been Bishop of *Ephesus*. But the same Persecution, which carried off *Simeon* the Son of *Cleopas*, carried off likewise all those Presbyters that were Kinsmen of our Lord. Thus the Church of *Jerusalem*, had nothing to distinguish it from other Churches, but that it was composed of *Jews*. But *Hadrian* ejected all of that race out of *Ælia Capitolina*, wherein none, that were Circumcised, were permitted to live. Not only in *Trajan's* time, but several years before him, the Christians were possess'd with a Belief, that the second

Apud.
Euseb.
Hist. Eccl.
l. 5.

cond Peculium was holier than the first, and thus the Seed of *Abraham* by Faith was to be prefer'd to his Seed by the Flesh; as to the right of the promises made to him. Now, altho' this disagreed with the opinion of the *Jews*, who valued themselves upon being descended from *Abraham* by the Flesh, yet it was consonant enough to the Reasonings of the Christians, who had the same interest in *Abraham's* Flesh, that the *Jews* cou'd pretend to. For *Isaac* was prefer'd to *Ismael*, and *Jacob* to *Esau*, as the Apostle of the Gentiles has observed, who nevertheless makes *Isaac* and *Jacob* Types of the younger Peculium. A like remark has ^{Epist. Barn.} been made by St. *Barnabas* his Collegue in ^{nab. c.} the Apostolate of the Gentiles, who obser-¹³ves, that when *Jacob* came to Bless the Sons of *Joseph*, he prefer'd *Ephraim* the younger to *Manasses* the Elder. The same Writer has observ'd, that *Jacob's* hands were then decussated in the Fashion of a Cross, hereby intimating to us, that after the Crucifixion of our Saviour, the lesser and younger Peculium shou'd enjoy the greater Privileges. The same Argument might be drawn from *Pharez*, and *Zara*, the Twin-Sons of *Thamar*, of whom he, that otherwise wou'd have been the youngest, broke his way first into the World. When these Prophecies were fulfill'd, both the pre eminence of the *Jews*, and the *Grafting* of the Gentiles, which St. *Paul* had acknowledged before, were of necessity to cease. Now altho' the Christians of *Jewish* extraction abominated these things

before they fell out, yet after they had happen'd, there was no reason for them to pretend, that this was fortuitous and not by the determin'd purpose of God; no more than it was doubted in the Case of *Cornelius*, whether the *Gentiles* were to be admitted into the new Peculium, without becoming first *Proselytes* of *Righteousness*; or in the Case of *S. Paul* and *S. Barnabas*, whether the *Gentiles* were to be invited into the Peculium, altho' both these things, before they happen'd, were not only directly contrary to the Opinion their Ancestors had of them; but also to that of the chief Apostles. 'Twas evident therefore, that these Events were to imputed to the over-ruling Wisdom of God, and consequently, that he was the Author of all those things, which might be deduced from these Events by Lawful Consequences, according to the manner of Reasoning then in use; for so they reasoned in the very History of the Apostles, *Acts* 15. 18.

XVII. The Church of *Jerusalem* being thus dissipated, and rifled of all its Prerogatives, that made it the head of the rest; it followed in the first place, that this Superiority was taken away by the Divine Providence. Now this being granted, there was no necessity for a new Revelation, to prove, that the other Churches, which own'd no Superior but that of *Jerusalem*, now she was gone, should themselves be supreme and enjoy the same rank which belong'd to her; for from her being the Metropolis of all the other Cities, it was manifest, that the rest were all equal to one another, and that the Me-

And that
according to
the Will of
our Lord &
his Apostles

Metropolitan Cities of the *Roman* Provinces were not invested with any Christian Dignity above the rest; for there was no order between the Synagogues of the foreign Cities; but all of them, not one excepted, were subject to the Sanedrim of *Jerusalem*, and to its Itinerary Ministers. And 'twas impossible things should be otherwise, while the Church of *Jerusalem* alone was intrusted with the Government of all other Churches, and all their Presbyteries had no coercive Power, as we have already observed. For this Parity was the reason, that there cou'd be no such thing as a Subordination among them: Therefore all Churches for the future were to be Supreme, and enjoy all those Rights of Primacy in common, which formerly belonged only to the Church of *Jerusalem*. And this our Lord plainly foretold: *St. John* 4. 21. as we suppose we have formerly proved in an *English* Treatise, about *One Priesthood*, and *One Altar*. Now when this had happened, no one doubted, but that our Lord had ordered it so to be; neither was there any need of a new Revelation of this kind to be inserted into the Canonical Books: Nay, if any Revelation had been necessary, there were Persons still alive, who might have been consulted; for *St. John* the Presbyter, survived the Martyrdom of *Simeon*. 'Tis probable, that what *St. Epiphanius* relates of *Ebion*, and *St. Irenaeus* of *Cerinthus*, viz. That *John* the beloved Disciple of the Lord, leapt out of the Bath before he had washed, because he was afraid, lest the Bath should

St. Iren.
l. 3. c. 9.

fall down, when *Cerinthus* the Enemy of the truth was there, happened towards the latter end of *Trajan's* Reign, at which time he publicly maintain'd his Heresie, in *Asia the Less*; tho' before he came thither in Person, he had taught his Heretical Doctrines in *Peræa*, after the Death of *St. Simeon* and the extinction of our Lord's Family. And indeed, towards the Conclusion of the aforesaid Reign, *Papias* Bishop of *Hierapolis*, met the same *John*, who was a different person from the Apostle, and in *Asia the Less*, as *Cerinthus* did. Both of the Name were Buried at *Ephesus*, I mean the aforesaid *John* the Presbyter, whom *Papias* saw, and *John* the Apostle, whom he never saw; and this was before *Ignatius* suffer'd Martyrdom, who makes mention of neither, even when he writ to the *Ephesians*. Therefore 'tis probable he Died in the middle space between *Simcon* and *Ignatius*, and was Buried in another Monument than *St. John* the Apostle was. There was likewise then alive another Disciple of our Lord, *Tristion* by Name, whom *Papias* in the like manner saw, and might personally have consulted, whether there was any thing in the Discipline of that Age, which the Apostles had condemn'd. The prophesying Daughters of *Philip* were likewise alive, of whom mention is made in the *Acts* of the Apostles. * *Quadratus* also

was alive, who had seen with his own Eyes the Dead raised up by our Lord; and so was *Poly carp*, and some other ancient Disciples of the Apostles, whom *St. Irenæus* saw and conversed with. And can we imagine, that all these would

concur

Apud Euseb.

concur to hold their Tongues, if any Innovations had been introduced, which wou'd have displeased the Apostles? Moreover these Ages were famous for the Gifts of the Holy Spirit, and for frequent Miracles, which are undeniable Arguments, that God upheld and maintain'd that Discipline. All which unwonted Favours cou'd never have been hoped for, if so great a change had proceeded from *Antichrist*, and the *Mystery of Iniquity*, as some *Opiniâtres* pretend. The Apostles, I am sure, used to argue after another manner, for when any matter was suspected by them, yet being overcome by contrary Revelations and Miracles, they dropt the Dispute, and fairly came over to the other side. Thus for Instance, in the case of *Cornelius*, St. Peter published the Revelation, which had been communicated to him. *When they heard these things, they held their peace, and glorified God, saying; Now therefore hath God given to the Gentiles Repentance to Life. Acts 11. 18.* Thus in the Council held by the Apostles in *Jerusalem*: *All the Multitude kept silence, and gave audience to Barnabas and Paul declaring, what Miracles and wonders God had wrought among the Gentiles by them, Acts 15. 12.* And being convinced by these Signs and Wonders, they fram'd a different Decree, from what they wou'd otherwise have done. And therefore the Disciples of the Apostles, that lived in these Ages wou'd have argued after the same manner, if they intended to imitate their Preceptors the Apostles: But to speak impartially,

these Men, that pay'd so great a respect to the Memory of the Apostles, had nothing to find Fault with. There was no reason, why they should be offended, if by the Divine providence interposing, some Rights, that were instituted by Christ and his Apostles, devolv'd upon other Churches. And much less, why they should complain of the persons, when those rights descended upon the Bishops of the first Sees, whom the Apostles had made the last in that Office.

XVIII.
The first
Bishops had
their power
given them
by the Apo-
stles, but
not such a
one as ex-
cused them
from their
Obedience
due to the
Apostles.

Thus we can hardly suppose, that the Apostles disapproved that, which we find ratified by the unanimous approbation of their most intimate Friends and Disciples, not so much as one standing out, as far as we know, or the least Foot-step, or trace of their dissent appearing. For the veracity of the Pontifical Book, is very much to be questioned, and much more the consequences, which *Blondell* would draw from thence. On the other hand 'tis most probable, that the Apostles so prepared the minds of their Disciples, that they receiv'd the succeeding form of Ecclesiastical Government quietly, and without the least Murmuring. Even those, who were alive, when the matter of Fact was most Fresh in their Minds, testify, that the first Bishops of Churches, at least, such as were Apostolical, as being Founded by the Apostles, were appointed by the Apostles themselves, altho' the name of *Bishops* was only given to the *Presbyteros*. *Hegeppus* has collected and compiled the Successions of them down from the very Apostles. *Tertullian* affirms, that

that Polycarp was placed by them in the Church of Smyrna, *Prescript c. 28.* and the Latin Interpreter of *Jrenaus*, that he was constituted by the Apostles, *l. 3. Adv. Her. c. 3.* And of the Apostles, that Founded the Church of Rome, they conferr'd upon Linus the Office of the Episcopate, says *Jrenaus*, in the abovemention'd place. Again the same Father asserts, that Bishops were instituted by the Apostles in the Churches, and elsewhere: The Bishops, to whom the Apostles intrusted the Churches, *l. 5. c. 20.* Nay, he ascribes the Successors of the Apostolical Churches, to the Apostles themselves. He speaks of the Successors of the Bishops, to whom, says he, they committed the care of the Church in all places, *l. 4. c. 63.* And *Tertulian* has a great deal to the same purpose. I thought it improper to cite any other Witnesses upon this occasion, but those of undoubted antiquity, and who lived nearest those times, to which their Testimonies relate. I might alledge the assertions of other ancient Writers, to make it appear beyond all denial, that they looked upon the Bishops to be the Successors of the Apostles. 'Tis indeed very probable, that the primitive Ancients included the *Προκαθήμενοι*, such as they were under the Church of Jerusalem, invested with no coercive Authority; under the name of Bishops: And that not without reason, since their order was the very same, upon which afterwards the Supreme Rights devolved. 'Tis certain, they comprehend all under this Name, who received
the

the *first Chair* from the Apostles. Thus they reckon *Linus*, *Anacletus*, and *Clemens* in the See of *Rome*, the very last of whom received this Dignity from the Apostles. However this new accession of honour, which perhaps might happen to the latter, might not happen to the former, while the Primacy of *Jerusalem* flourished. From hence it evidently appears, that upon these Successions of the Apostolical Sees, the Title of *First the Chair* might be common to them all, and yet that the power of those, that held these *First Chairs* was not one and the same, so that from hence we can by no means conclude, that the name of *Bishops* was attributed to all these Successors, I mean, as 'tis the proper name of an Order distinct from the Presbyters, and much less that Power, which occasioned the peculiar right of the *Πρωτοκαθεδρος*, to be called by a peculiar Name. And therefore since this manner of arguing does not hold in all the Successors of the Apostolical Sees, in the Apostolical Age, we cannot be certain whether it will hold in any one Successor, who might even be the last. On the contrary, Reason seems to tell us, that this power which became common to all *Bishops* afterwards, was not given, at least in this Apostolical Age, to the *Chief Chairmen* of the other Sees, whom the Apostles themselves constituted, that so they might be the next Principles of a Visible Unity after God and Christ. For the result of it would have been this, that such Bishops must own no obedience, either to the Apostles, or to the Bishop of *Jerusalem* him-

himself, at least in such things, as belonged to their respective Diocesses. Nay, the Apostles wou'd have drawn the Judgment of God and Christ upon themselves, had they taken upon them to call into Question the Judgment of such Bishops. And these Consequences wou'd have follow'd according to the manner of Arguing used in that Age, as we have already observed : Nay, all the Apostles in Conjunction cou'd not give such a Power without the consent of the Bishop of *Jerusalem*; for this Prerogative was peculiar to him, as being the first Apostle, to whom, altho' they were equal in all other Respects, yet they were inferior to him in this, because he cou'd not be otherwise than chief among the Apostles. And therefore if any of the Apostles had absolved any other Bishop from his Obedience due to the Bishop of *Jerusalem*, without his consent, the invisible Bishop above wou'd not have ratified it in Heaven; and besides the Apostle, who had consecrated that Bishop, and whom, by that Right, he had made a Bishop, wou'd have separated himself from the Peculium, and all Rights belonging to it. Now we can hardly imagine, that any such Power was Communicated to the Bishops, while the Bishops acknowledged the Apostles to have a superior Authority; and the Church of *Jerusalem* exercised the Rights, that were peculiar to it, upon these very Bishops, in whatever part of the World they were Constituted; however, this does not hinder, but that the Apostles, while they were Living, might

might admonish the Church of what Obedience they owed to the Bishops after their Decease, as *Moses* had done in the Case of *Joshua*. And this I take to be the true State of this Affair.

XIX. We have already observ'd, that many of the *Jerusalem* Clergy resided in *Asia the Less* in the beginning of the second Century. Here in all probability were those Persons, whose Traditions *Irenaeus* heard in *Asia*, as also those whom his Master *Polycarp* both saw and heard, for both *Polycarp* and *Irenaeus* seem to have been Natives of *Asia*. Here *Papias*, who was also Bishop of *Hierapolis* in *Asia*, met those, whose Traditions he Collected. Here he learnt his Traditions concerning *St. Peter*, *St. Andrew*, *St. Philip*, *St. Thomas*, *St. James*, *St. John* and *St. Matthew* the Apostles. Here, as he himself informs us, he saw and heard the Propheying Daughters of *Philip*, as also *John* and *Aristion*, the Disciples of our Lord, whom he calls *Presbyters*, and who, 'tis probable, belonged to the second Order of the Clergy of *Jerusalem*. He mentions no Tradition concerning *Simeon*, altho' he suffered Martyrdom under *Trajan* the Emperor, which can hardly be accounted for, if he had gathered his Traditions in *Palestine* the Fountain Head of them And therefore 'tis probable that most of these Apostles were not only for a short time in *Asia*, but resided there. The aforesaid *Papias* affirms, that *St. John* the Apostle and *Presbyter* were both Buried at *Ephesus*. *Polycrates* asserts the same of *St. Philip* the Apostle; and indeed *Clemens Alexandrinus*

'After *Simeon's* Martyrdom the Apostolical Colledge was at *Ephesus*, where *St. John* the Apostle was President;

Alexandrinus informs us, that *St. John* lived a little while at *Ephesus*, and more than once visited all *Asia*, at least that which was called the *Proconsular*. *Polycrates* adds, that he was a Priest and wore the *πύταλον* or *Golden Plate*. His being a Priest had nothing singular in it, since the rest of the Apostles belonged to that chief College of the Clergy of *Jerusalem*, which exactly answered the *Archieratical* College of the *Jewish Sanedrim*. Neither had it been for the glory of the new, but holier *Peculium*, if he had bore a Priesthood among the Jews, especially if compared to his Collegues in the holier Pontificate of the new *Peculium*, as it was here done by *Polycrates*, who unquestionably intended some distinguishing, some peculiar Honour to *St. John* the Apostle, which made him respected before the other Apostles even of his own Order. 'Tis plain therefore, he meant the chief Priesthood, by which he became a Priest by way of Eminence, and wore the badge of it, viz. The *Golden Plate* in his Forehead. Indeed, after the Death of *Simeon*, and the extinction of *David's* and our Lord's Race; *St. John*, by his own Right was *Πρωτοπρεσβυτερος* or Chief Chairman of the surviving Apostles, as being the only Man left of three, whom *Clement Alexandrinus* affirms to have been the Chief of the Apostles that were not Kinsmen. And this the Nature of the thing it self shews, as we have already observed: For which Reason I conjecture, that when that Church of *Jerusalem*, which resided at *Pel-*

Apud Enset.
Hist. Ecc.
l. 3. c. 31.
& l. 5. c.
24. Gr.

la, was dissipated by the *Romans* after the Martyrdom of *Simeon*, the *Ebionæans* immediately raised new Commotions and Disorders at *Peræa*, and forced the Apostles to leave the place, who were then busied in choosing a Bishop of *Jerusalem* in *Simeon's* room. *Epiphanius* assures us, that from hence they translated some Colonies of their Sect into *Asia*, and that the Apostles being informed of it, betook themselves from that place of their Banishment into *Asia*, the *Romans* hindering them from returning to *Palestine*, and that at last they fixed their abode at *Ephesus*, on purpose to prevent the growth of this spreading Heresie : That here they composed one Body under *St. John* their President, who wore the *Golden Plate* as the Badge of his Supremacy ; but that the Apostles, who met there, did not live much longer after this, since we read of no new Attempts of the *Romans* against them. *Irenæus* indeed testifies, that *St. John* remained at *Ephesus*, till the time of *Trajan* ; in which place he likewise takes notice, that *Cerinthus* was there condemn'd by him. What *Irenæus* relates of *Cerinthus*, the very same does *Epiphanius* report of *Ebion*. This Apostle therefore, during his abode in *Ephesus*, a City of *Asia Minor*, published his Gospel, as the afore said *Irenæus* testifies, and indeed with that Design and Purpose, That he shou'd extirpate that Error, which *Cerinthus* had planted in Men : For after this manner the same Apostolical Writer Expresses himself. Now 'tis morally impossible, that *Irenæus* shou'd be

Iren. l. 3.
c. 3.

Iren. l. 3.
c. 1.

Iren. l. 3.
c. 2.

be deceived in any of these particulars, who, when he was a Young Man, heard *Polycarp* the Disciple of *St. John* in *Asia*, when the Evangelical History was very recent in their Memories ; and, unless I am mistaken, the following words of the Gospel are to be understood in the Person of the Apostles, who were then present : *This is the Disciple, who gives his Testimony about these things, and has wrote concerning them, and we know, that his Testimony is true*, *St. John* 21. 24. namely we the Apostles, who here by their own Testimony likewise approve, what he had written. For some other Commentators have very erroneously applied these words to the *Presbyters* of the Church of *Ephesus*. But the *Presbyters* wou'd not have presumed to make any Interpolations upon the sacred Text of the Gospel of their own devising. Besides they were not competent Witnesses of the Original of Christianity, as 'tis delivered in the Gospel, since they were Converted to Christianity so many Years after it, when *St. Paul* founded the Church at *Ephesus*, *Acts* 19. 1. For * *Clemens Romanus* testifies, that the first Governors of Churches were Constituted by the Apostles out of the first Fruits of those Churches. Neither, indeed, can we suppose those Persons thoroughly vers'd in the Rudiments of Christianity, who, although they had been made partakers of Baptism by *St. John*, were Baptised again by *St. Paul*, *ver.* 3. 4. 5. at which time they did not so much as know whether there was a Holy Ghost : For our Saviour

* *Epist. ad*
Cor. n. 401

Saviour commanded his Disciples to Baptise in the Name of the Holy Ghost, *Mat.* 28. 19. and *St. John* the Baptist told the *Jews*, whom he had admitted to Baptism, that the Lord would Baptise with the Holy Ghost. *St. Mat.* 3. 11. *St. Mark* 1. 8. *St. Luke* 3. 16. *St. John* 1. 33. as the Apostle of the Gentiles himself also observed in this very place of the *Acts*. Nay, it was a branch of the Apostolical Office, to be a witness of the things that were done by our Lord, *Acts* c. 1, 22. c. 26. 16. and 'twas beneath the dignity of that Function, to want another Man's commendation, *viz.* of one, who had not been an Apostle himself, *2 Cor.* 3. 1. and yet it was customary with the Apostles to interpose their own words, when they were in the presence of the Chief Writer, who writ. Thus we find *Tertius*, who was the Apostles Amanuensis, Salutes the *Romans* in his own Name, *Rom.* 16. 22. And therefore *St. John's* Gospel does not wholly rely upon his own authority, but likewise that of the Apostles, who were then present. Neither has he set his Name to his first Epistle, of which there never was any doubt rais'd in the Church. *Dionysius* of *Alexandria* has long ago observed, how cautiously he abstains from making any mention of his own Name, not only here, but also in the Gospel, which bears his Name. And in the beginning of this Epistle he speaks in the name of many, tho' afterwards he speaks in the singular number. The Reason of his doing so is easie to be gathered out of these primitive Hypotheses

Apud
Euseb.
Hist. Eccl.
l. 7 c. 25.

Hypotheses we have already lay'd down: He omitted this honour, as solely belonged to the first Presidents of the Apostles, who alone were to set their own Names to those Epistles, which were wotted by the common approbation of the whole Colledge of the Apostles, excepting only the Letter of the Council of *Jerusalem*, which is not inscribed in the Name of the President; but that of both Colleges. 'Tis certain, that *St. Peter* and *St. Paul*, who were not Presidents of the Apostolical Colledge inscribed their Epistles in their own Names: And so likewise does *St. James* the President in his, and *St. Jude*, whom I suppose to have written his, while there was a *sede vacante* in *Jerusalem*. *St. John* perhaps thought this inconsistent with his Modesty, who not only by his own Suffrage had voted the Presidenship of our Lord's Kinsmen, but rather reckon'd himself a *Presbyter*, than an *Apostle*, because he had not the Honour to be related to our Blessed Saviour. But for my part, I conjecture from the plural number, with which he begins his Epistle, that while he was Writing it, some other persons were present, to whom he durst not prefer himself, and those cou'd be none other, than Apostles. This is the reason, why he so much urges the *Fellowship with us*, which in another place he calls *our Fellowship*, meaning, that of the whole Apostolical College. 1.3. And indeed he does nothing but enumerates the Mystical benefits of that Fellowship throughout his whole Epistle, *Fellowship with the Father and*
H the

the Son, and Light, Life, and Truth, which
 he ascribes to the *Word* in his Gospel:
 Not only for the same reason, that the Vi-
 sible Communion of the modern Churches
 makes us partakers of the Mystical Benefits
 of the Invisible Communion, but also be-
 cause that was looked upon to be the Ori-
 ginal Church of the new Peculium, which
 was joyn'd to the Apostles, and because those
 Mystical Benefits were believed to belong
 immediately to the Original Church, nor o-
 therwise to belong to the younger Churches,
 than those very Churches were grafted upon
 the Apostolical Church, as we have shown else-
 where. Now that this Epistle was written
 in the last part of this Apostle's Life these
 words demonstrate: *Omnis Spiritus, qui sol-*
vit Jesum (for so the Vulgar Interpreter reads
 it conformable to the Ancients) or as we
 render it, *every Spirit that confesseth not, that*
Jesus Christ is come in the Flesh, is not of God,
 C. 4. v. 3. This passage directly confronted
 the Doctrine of certain Hereticks, who held,
 that Jesus was a different person from Christ,
 affirming, that Christ did not descend upon
 Jesus, till such time, as he was Baptised, and
 that when Jesus afterwards suffered, Christ
 flew away from him. 'Tis after this
 manner, that *Irenaeus* talks of *Cerinthus*,
 who taught the same absurdities, if he
 was not the same with *Ebion*. Hitherto
 allude those words, Chap. 5. 1. *Every*
one, who believes, that Jesus is the
Christ, is born of God, and v. 5. *Who is it, that*
overcomes the World, but he, who believes, that
Jesus is the Son of God? As also these that
 preceded

preceded, 1. 4. 3. Every Spirit, that does not confess Jesus Christ coming in the Flesh, is not of God. To the same purpose likewise are those words of the Gospel, *The word was made Flesh*, St. John 1. 14. reflecting upon that Heretical Doctrine, which did not appear in *Asia* till towards the latter time of St. John.

By this means the Church of *Jerusalem* was levell'd, and the Primacy thereof translated to that of *Ephesus*. 'Tis certain, that Church was still in being, since there are reckon'd thirteen Bishops of that See, from the Martyrdom of *Simeon* down to *Mark*, the first Bishop of the new Colony call'd *Ælia Capitolina*, towards the conclusion of *Hadrian's* Reign. However, the next Successor of *Simeon* had no right over the Apostles, as being himself no Apostle. Hence it follows, that he was subject to the Apostles, and to the abovementioned President of the Apostolical College, and that he had nothing of pre-eminence to boast of, over the Bishops of the Ordinary Churches. 'Tis evident, the Church of *Rome* did not obey the Bishop of *Jerusalem*, when a Colony was sent to *Ælia Capitolina* in the Emperour *Hadrian's* time. Otherwise the Church, which now was wholly composed of *Gentiles*, to gather with a *Gentile* Bishop at the head of them, could never have come into the place of the *Jews*, that were driven from thence, for we need not question, but that this was much against the Will of the latter. But, much less possible was it for a new Colony to have dif-

XX.

From this time the Primacy translated from the Church of Jerusalem to that of Ephesus.

fer'd so much from the Jews in celebrating the Feast of *Easter*, the Observation of which Day they took from their Metropolitcal City of *Rome* : For it was not in the power even of the Church of *Rome* to change that Jewish Custom while she pay'd Obedience to the Church of *Jerusalem*, which was most strictly observant of its Country Customs, as far as 'twas Lawful. But the Apostles were now thoroughly convinced by those Signs and Wonders they had seen, that God was displeased at the preeminence of the Jews, and wou'd no longer countenance it. After the Destruction of the Temple they found that they cou'd not perform those Offices which belonged to that sacred place ; for which reason they betook themselves to a mystical Interpretation of those Offices ; nay, even of those which solely concerned the Jewish Nation. *Barnabas* observes this Conduct all along in his Epistle, and the whole sect of the *Essenes* were ready enough to understand these Offices in this Sense. They found that Circumcision was an useless Burthen upon them, while the Tribute that was gathered from the Circumcised, was transferr'd from the Worship of the true God to that of Idols in the Temple of Peace. They saw that these received Opinions of the Jews were an everlasting Obstacle to the Conversion of the Gentiles, and hinder'd them from growing into one Body and Communion. Neither is it irrational to suppose, that many of the *Jews*, but especially the *Essenes*, were by this time, weary of Circumcision,

cumcision, when they were so rigorously
 prest by the severity of the *Roman Laws*.
 Therefore they thought it the most expedient
 to Peace, to permit those Jews that were
 willing, the free use of the Mosaical Cere-
 monies, but not to impose them upon such
 as were unwilling. It manifestly appears by
S. Justin's Dialogue with Tryphon, that they
 steer'd this middle Course; so that *St Jerome*,
 and the Schoolmen that follow him,
 are very much mistaken, who held those
 Ceremonies to be Sinful after the Temple of
Jerusalem was levell'd to the Ground. How-
 ever, when they saw these Men of *Jerusa-*
lem so obstinately Tenacious of their Coun-
 try Rites, they left them to themselves in
 Peace; however they thought it conveni-
 ent to Translate the Authority of the chief
 Seat from them, least they should seem to
 impose any unnecessary Yoke upon those that
 were unwilling: Neither need we doubt
 that this Translation of the first See was
 commanded by several express Revelations,
 which were now both necessary and reason-
 able, since Providence it self interposed to
 forbid the longer Observation of these Rites,
 even to such as were willing to comply with
 them. They might likewise remember the
 Words of the Lord, *I say unto you, that the*
Kingdom of Heaven shall be taken away from
you, and be given to a Nation bringing forth
the Fruits thereof. *St. Mat. 8. 12.* as also
 the following ones; *But the Sons of the*
Kingdom shall be turned out. *St. Mat. 8. 12.*
 For we find our Lord utter'd several Oracles,
 which,

which, when they were spoken, his Apostles cou'd not tell what to make of; but when they were fulfill'd, they understood well enough, St. Luke. 22. 61. and 24. 8. *Acts* 11. 16. Nay, our Lord himself had promised them, that the Paraclete should do all this. *He will put you in mind of all the things, that I have said unto you*, St. John 14. 26.

XXI.
By this Apostolical
College of Ephe-
sus the *Πρεσβυτεριον*,
called Bishops, and
invested with a new
power,

So then about this time, when the Seat of the Apostolical College was translated to *Ephesus*, the Name of BISHOP, as I conjecture, and that too by the Authority of the Apostles, began to be properly applied to the first Chairmen. St. *Irenæus's* words concerning *Polycarp* are express to this purpose: *Polycarp was not only taught by the Apostles, and conversed with many of those, that saw our Lord; but also was constituted Bishop in Asia, in the Church, which is at Smyrna.* Here we may plainly trace out a College of Apostles in *Asia*; by whose common Authority *Polycarp* was appointed Bishop of *Smyrna*. Now why shou'd we doubt, that *Irenæus* used the word BISHOP, especially when applied, as here, to one particular Man, in the very same signification, as was commonly given it in the Age, wherein he writ? Or what Reason have we to doubt of the Matter of Fact, which he heard from *Polycarp* himself, when he was a young Man in *Asia*? That *Polycarp* was President of the Presbytery, plainly appears from his own Epistle to the *Philippians*, mention'd likewise by *Irenæus*, which none of the An-
cients,

cients, as far as I remember, ever offer'd to call in Question. Now this Testimony of *Irenæus* is above all exception. Of the same College of Apostles at *Ephesus* are we to understand the afore-cited Testimonies of *Irenæus*, wherein he affirms, that Bishops were Constituted by them in every place. Besides *St. Jerome* testifies, that *St. John* writ his Gospel at the intreaty of the Bishops of Asia. It follows therefore from hence, that there were Bishops in Asia, before that Gospel was published, and consequently before the Apostles were Dead; who, as we have already demonstrated, resided in the same place with our President, when he writ his Gospel, and confirm'd it with their own Testimony. *St. Jerome* wou'd have said at the intreaty of the Presbyteries of Asia, (whereof there were several in those parts) if he had meant Presbyters by the word Bishops. For the Petitions of Societies or Bodies of Men must have been made apart, and in several places; whereas the Petitions of the Bishops might have been delivered conveniently enough at one and the same time in a Synod. In like manner *Clemens Alexandrinus* recounting, what things *St. John* the Apostle did in *Ephesus*, after his Banishment into *Patmos*, makes mention of the Bishop of the City, who surely cou'd be no one else but the President himself: For no one cou'd be properly call'd Presbyter of the City; because there were many Presbyters in every City. The same Writer affirms, that when the same Apostle visited the Provinces ad-

De Div.
Salv. & a-
pud Euseb
Hist. Eccl
. 2. c. 23.

joyning to *Ephesus*; he appointed *Bishops*
 in some places, constituted whole *Churches* in
 other places, and in others κληρον ἕνα τινὰ κληρο-
 νου. i. e. *Ordained one Clerk*. In my Opini-
 on now, he supposes *Whole Churches* to have
 been in those very places, where *St. John*
 Constituted *Bishops*. This we may gather
 from the Opposition between the first and
 second Member of the Division. He like-
 wise supposes *Ecclesiastical Rulers* to be
 meant by the Name of *Churches*, since he
 opposes ἕνα κληρον, i. e. *One Clerk* to Ἐκκλη-
 σίας ὅλαις, i. e. *Whole Churches*, which con-
 sequently must be Composed of all the Cler-
 gy: He supposes a great part of them to
 have been Converts. Now there were want-
 ing *Rulers*, to whom the Apostle might
 Communicate Authority. Thus the Ἐκκλη-
 σίας ὅλαις were intire Presbyteries together with
 their President; and therefore only the Pre-
 sidents are to be understood under the Name
 of *Bishops*, who were Constituted in those
 places, where there was no necessity, that
Whole Churches should be appointed. Thus
 we see, that the Apostle did not look upon
 those to be *Whole Churches*, that wanted
 Presidents to govern them, whom *Clement*
 in this place calls by their proper Name
Bishops, and therefore the Apostle every
 where supplied the Presidents at least under
 that new Name of *Bishops*; and otherwise
 it could not be done since there were Πρωτοκ-
 ληροι, or *Chief Chairmen* of the Presbyteries,
 as we have already observed; for now 'twas
 high time to take care of Posterity, the
 Primacy

Primacy of *Jerusalem* being abolished ; and the Apostles that were then present, not like to live much longer. The Apostles, in my Opinion, adorn'd Chief Chairmen with this new Title of *Bishops*, hereby to declare them their Successors in the plenitude of their Power ; for as we have shown the Word signifies a supreme Power subject only to God. Neither is it incredible, that the Apostles had express Revelations as to this affair, altho' we want the Monuments of the latter part of the Apostolical History to prove it. 'Twas so we are sure when St. John received his *Apocalypse* in *Patmos*. There we find them called *Angels*, who were sent by the President of the Apostolical College to rule the Churches committed to their Care. The Reason is plain, because the Messengers of God, who is the only invisible Bishop, were called *Angels*. In like manner the Messengers of the President of *Jerusalem*, were distinguished by that Name, as far as the Name of *Bishop* belonged to him in common with God. Thus the Name of Bishop was greater than that of Angel ; for Angels might be sent by the Bishops, when the Bishops themselves were sent by none but God himself. *Papias* Bp. of *Hierapolis*, lived next to these times, who, tho' he saw none of these Apostles, yet he conversed with many that had seen them, as also the chief Disciples of our Lord, viz. John the *Presbyter*, and *Aristion*. John the *Presbyter* was Buried at *Ephesus*, in

in all probability, before *Ignatius* writ his *E-*
pistle to the *Ephesians*, otherwise 'tis hardly
to be conceived, but that this Apostolical Mar-
tyr would have saluted him. There-
fore the *Charimen* had the name of *Bishop*
given them before the Martyrdom of *Ignatius*.
have purposely forbore to cite the Testimo-
nies of those of a later date, because I wou'd
not mingle uncertainty with Truth.

XXII. However this Magnificent Title of *Bi-*
And yet this shop did not hinder, but that those, upon
new Title of whom it was conferr'd, were still subject to
Bishop did the Superior authority of the Apostolical Col-
not exempt lege. This we gather from that passage in
them from *Clemens*, where he shews, that one Clergy-
being subject man sometimes has been inserted by the A-
to the Apo- postles into the Ecclesiastical Catalogue:
stles. For this was done, where there was an in-
tire or whole Church, consisting of a due
number of Presbyters, and a Bishop at the
head of them, for that Church wanted only
one Clerk to be added to the rest. And there-
fore it was Lawful for the Apostles, with-
out so much as asking the consent of the Bi-
shop, to insert a Clerk into the Ecclesiastical
Catalogue. So 'tis plain, that the Bishops
had not as yet obtain'd so high a privilege, as
to be reckon'd next to God, and be judged
by none, but him alone, at least if compared
to the Apostles. There is a particular rea-
son, why the Bishops might owe Obedience
and Submission to the Apostles, which by
the very name of the *Episcopos* they cou'd
owe to no other mortal whatever. 'Twas ne-
cessary, that the Church below should depend
upon

upon the Church above, since it could not obtain any Benefits of the Mystical Communion, but so far as it conformed to the Original. But the Original Church of the new Peculium, is no other than that of the Apostles, whose head is the $\lambda\gamma\theta$, or Word, who is also the invifible Bishop: So that as the vifible Bishop depends upon the $\lambda\gamma\theta$, if he defires that his Acts may be ratified in Heaven; fo likewise upon the Body of the $\lambda\gamma\theta$, whose head that $\lambda\gamma\theta$ is, and in fhort upon that Original Body, which is likewise the Original Church. For in vain does the Bishop admit any one into his Communion, unlefs the fame admiffion confers a right to the Original Church; and on the other hand in vain does the Vifible Bishop exclude us from his Communion, unlefs that exclusion fhuts us likewise out of the fame. Therefore the whole authority of the Church below is derived from its agreement and concord with the Original above, fo that it has no manner of force, if it difagrees with that. This is the true reason, why the Apostles cou'd not confer any power fo large and plenary, as to have any force over themfelves, or to exempt the Bifhops from Apostolical jurifdiction; for both while they were alive upon Earth, as now after their Death in Heaven, they constituted one Body, whose Head was Chrift: neither can the Bifhops make us partakers of the Heavenly rights upon any other Foot, than as they build us upon the Foundation of the Apostles, that we may grow up in one Body with

with them, as we have shewn elsewhere : For only this Body has a pretence to claim the Heavenly rights. Therefore the Communion of the Bishop signified nothing, if it admitted us into any other Body than that of the Apostles, and were invested with no celestial Privileges. This is the reason, why the very name of *Bishop* declares him, to have a Supreme power over all other Mortals except the Apostles. Thus the Apostles without doing any prejudice to their own Authority, bestowed upon the Bishops, by them created, together with the name a certain power, which was to be transmitted to their Successors to all ages of the World. Otherwise they had given them a meer insignificant shadow of a Name, and the power signified by the Name had expired of course, after the Death of the Apostles.

The Episcopate established by the College of Ephesus, about the year 106, before the Canon of the Gospel was confirmed by them.

I confess 'tis a difficult task, in this so great an obscurity of these ancient times, to assign the precise time, when these *Chief* *Chairman* had this new Title of *Bishops* confer'd upon them by the Apostles. However, I hope my performance, will not be unacceptable to those of the Ecclesiastical Function, if I endeavour, as far as I am able, to clear this Difficulty. From what has been said already upon this head, it evidently appears, that it happen'd after the Martyrdom of *Simeon* the Son of *Cleopas*. For the Apostles did not convene at *Ephesus* under their President *St. John* before this time, who, as we have proved, bestow'd this Name upon

upon the *Chief Chairmen*. After this account it must have fallen out after the year of our Lord 104, or 105, upon one of which we placed the Death of *Simeon*. And yet it must have been before the Death of *Xystus* Bishop of Rome, whom we conjecture to have died A. D. 112. for *Irenaeus* reckons this *Xystus* the first of those; who celebrated the Feast of *Easter*, on a different day from that, on which the *Asiatic* Apostles observed it. And this he must have done after the Apostolical College at *Ephesus* was extinct; for while that was in being, no Bishops wou'd have presumed to disagree from it, even in their own districts. We have already shewn, that no Churches were invested with any power so great as to make innovations at home, but whatever power there was, that it was wholly lodged in the hands of the Apostolical Itineraries, who we cannot suppose wou'd abolish any of the received customs of the Apostles. Now 'tis certain, that together with the Episcopal Name *Xystus* had likewise the Authority of a Bishop; and 'tis as undeniable, that there was no example of the Surviving Apostles to the contrary. But when they were once dead, *Xystus* had a full power, to act according to his own pleasure in indifferent things, at least in his own Diocess. I must confess, that this custom of celebrating *Easter*, which was introduced by *Chrystus*, seems to be of ancient date, than the Colony of *Aelia Capitolina*; for those of *Jerusalem* were of the same Opinion with the *Romans* in *Victor's* time;

*Epist ad
Vict apud
Euseb.
Hist. Eccl:
l. 5. 25:
Gr.*

Epist ad time; because, when they were carried down
Vict. apud. thither, they still retained the custom, as it
Euseb. was observed at Rome. With this agree the
Hist. Eccl. Successions of the *Ephesian* Bishops, mention'd
l. 5. 25. by *Polycrates*, who reckons up Seven Bishops
Gr. all related to him, who sat in that See be-
 fore him, himself being the Eighth. And
 so many Successions there were likewise in
 the *Roman* See, from *Xystus* to *Victor*, to
 whom that Epistle is address'd. Thus so
 ancient we find, was both the Name and
 power of Bishops in the See of *Ephesus*. For
 before the Apostles of the *Ephesian* College
 were all extinct; the first Bishop of *Ephesus*
 could not commence, that's certain. But in
 other places the Apostles had constituted Bi-
 shops before, while themselves, together
 with their President, were yet alive. There-
 fore the Epoch of Episcopat is to be placed
 in some middle time, between the coming of
 the Apostles into *Asia*, and their decease.
 For my part, I guess it to have been just in
 the beginning of the *Ephesian* College. 'Tis
 plain, the Bishops were constituted before
St. John writ this Gospel, because he is said,
 to have compiled it at their intreaty. We
 have already seen, that the Apostles were
 upon the spot with him, when he writ it,
 what then should hinder them from being
 present, when he constituted Bishops? Now,
 if the *Ebioneans* were the occasion of the A-
 postles meeting together in *Asia*, 'tis certain,
 it must have been some time after the Mar-
 tyrdom of *Simeon*; for after the Apostles
 were forced to fly from *Perea* or *Judea*, then
 and

and not before did *Thebanhis* aspire to be made Bishop, (of *Jerusalem*, 'tis probable) who alone had the Name of Bishop at that time. But being disappointed of his hopes there, he made the first Succession of the *Ebioneans* in *Perea* itself. *Epiphanius* informs us, that *Nazara* was there, from whence they had likewise the Name of *Nazarenes*. From these parts this Heresie found its way into *Asia*, to extinguish which in its infancy the Apostles met at *Ephesus*. 'Tis probable, they were not as yet come into *Asia*, when the abovemention'd Heresie first appear'd there. *Hegesippus* testifies, that the Reverence, the Apostles had over them, restrain'd them from professing an open Separation, therefore we can hardly suppose, that they would have come into *Asia*, if they had known, that any of the Apostles were there. But one year is sufficient for the two Com-motions of the *Ebioneans* to have happen'd in; as well in *Perea*, as in *Asia*. But the Episcopat constituted by the Apostles of *Ephesus*, cou'd hardly be later, than A.D. 107. For then the Christians made new expedi-tions, in order to propagate the Faith. One of these was carried into *India*, lately conquer-ed by *Palma*, and by this we come to discover the time of the Expedition. At that time, those new Preachers carried the Written Books of the Gospels along with them into those places, which they had converted, as we find in (a) *Eusebius*. And (b) *Pantenus* found the Gospel of St. *Matthew* in the same *India*, as 'tis probable. many years a-fterwards

(a) Eu-
seb. Hist.
Eccl. l. 3.
37. Gr.

(b) Eu-
seb. Hist.
Eccl. l. 5.
10.

afterwards, which had been brought thither
 by *St. Bartholomew*, as 'twas reported; and
 this was after *St. John* had Written his Go-
 spel in *Asia*; for I am of Opinion, that the
 Book of the Written Gospels was collected
 by this Apostolical College at *Ephesus*, and by
 them recommended to the Church. We
 here find mention made of several written
 Gospels, whence 'tis no impertinent conjecture
 that the Book is meant, wherein the Gospels
 were collected. We find by the Testimony
 of *Eusebius*, concerning *Pantenus*, that *St.*
Matthew's Gospel made one of the number,
 and *Eusebius* expressly tells us, that the three
 Gospels were approved by *St. John* in these
 following words, 'Tis reported, that he ap-
 proved of them, and witnessed, as to their ve-
 racity. Now what occasion was there for
 him to approve them by his Testimony, un-
 less the truth of them had been uncertain,
 because as yet they had layn hid in a few
 private hands, and had not appear'd openly
 and in the publick Light? But from this
 passage we may trace out the time; when
 the Apostle gave this Testimony of them;
 for being asked his opinion concerning those
 Evangelists, he observed, that they made no
 mention of the things done by our Lord, be-
 fore *St. John* was cast into prison: for which
 reason, those of *Asia* earnestly importun'd
 him, that he himself would be pleased to
 supply the defect, which he had remark'd in
 them. So then 'tis plain, he declared his own
 opinion concerning the other Evangelists, when
 he undertook to write his fourth Gospel,
 which

which he perform'd in *Asia* at the instance of the *Asiatick* Bishops, as we have already observ'd ; and that must consequently be at the same time, when the Apostolical College was conven'd at *Ephesus*. And therefore 'tis probable, that not only his Gospel, but the other three, that were written before, were approved by the Testimonies of the same Apostles then present. Neither is this all, but 'tis reasonable to believe, that this Book of the four Gospels so solemnly ratified, was lay'd up in their Archives, that the veracity of it thus confirmed might be known to all. As for the Original Manuscript of *St. John*, the Author of the *Chronicon Paschale* affirms, that it was kept in *Ephesus* in his time. There is no disagreement in the time, to make any one disbelieve, what he asserts. Chroni.
Pasch.
Edit.
Cangii.
p. 5

I find in *Ignatius*, that the Gospel of *St. Matthew* was preserved in the same Archives of *Ephesus*: I heard, says he, some saying, that if I don't find it so in the Archives, I won't believe the Gospel, and when I told them again, that it was written, they answer'd me *ὅτι πρὸς ἡμᾶς* that it was extant and to be seen. Ignat.
Epist.
ad Phil.
N. 8.

It seems *Ignatius* had produced a passage out of the Gospel of *St. Matthew* against the *Heresy* of the *Docetæ*, wherein Christ is said to deny, that he was an incorporeal *Dæmon*. True it is, that this holy Martyr unwarily confounded the genuine Gospel of *St. Matthew* with the interpolated one, such as the *Ebionæans*, who now Scatter'd their infectious Doctrines in *Asia*, used to cite. Here now the *Hereticks* deny, with Justice too on their side, that those

*Ignat. ad.
Smyrn. N.*

words were to be found in the Gospel, such as it came from St. *Matthew*, and then appeal to the Archives, wherein the Authentic copy of St. *Matthew* was repositd to be consulted by all upon occasion; and therefore they declare, that they will not be determined by the words of the Gospel, as they were found in the common Copies, since they disagreed from the Authentic Book, that was warranted by the publick Faith of the Archives. And when *Ignatius* urged, that the Reading was so in that copy which he used (for unless I am mistaken, this he means by the words *ὅτι γέγραπται*.) the *Hereticks* reply, that the Authentick copy, to which they had appeal'd, was *extant and to be seen*, and therefore he might consult it to satisfy himself, whether these words belonged to the Evangelist, or no. This I am confident, they mean by the word, *πρόκειται*, which directly answers *προβιβέναι*, a word commonly used in promulging the Edicts of Princes. Thus we find in St. *Jude* *πρόκεινται δειγμα*, they were made an example, as the vulgar Interpreter has render'd it, to the end that they might be known by all. Thus *προβιβέναι*, is translated *proposita*, in the ancient Glossaries, which word is often used to signify the Latin Decrees of Princes. In like manner *Κεφάλια*, are things repositd in places for that purpose, but especially in written Monuments. So the Critics call an Author's Text, *Κείμενον*, and *Κεῖται* Signifies the same as *legi*, to be read, among Authors of unquestionable credit. Thus we find *Ulpian* in

in *Athenæus* got the name of *Karai* (C), be-
 cause when there happen'd any debate a-
 bout a word, he us'd always to ask that
 troublesome question, *Karai; a i karai*
 that is to say, *was it to be found in any*
Classick Authors or no? And therefore all
 Authentick Writings that are laid up in
 Archives are very properly said *repositæ*,
 since they are reposit'd there to that end, that
 an appeal may be made to them, when there
 is occasion. Upon which account these
Asiatick Archives were to be consulted, to find
 out the true genuine words of *St. Matthew*;
 and unless I am mistaken, the veracity of the
 present Book of the Gospels, which we now
 use, is derived from the *Ephesian* Archives.
 'Tis reasonable to believe, that Copies ap-
 proved by so Authentick a Testimony, as that
 of the *Ephesian* College, wou'd immediately be
 received by all Churches, which at that time
 acknowledg'd the Supream authority of that
 College. Now they were reposit'd in the
 Archives, with this intention, 'tis probable,
 that by this means they might be known
 to all. This is the reason, why *Irenæus*, a
 Native of *Asia*, owns no more, nor fewer
 Gospels than four; because he had found the
 same number of Gospels in the *Ephesian* Ar-
 chives. Nay *Justin Martyr*, who writ be-
 fore him, and yet was younger than he, ack-
 nowledges the same number: Not only *St.*
Justin, who was a *Samaritan*, but *Hegeſippus*,
 who was a Jew, fall into the same mistake
 with our *Ignatius*, who was a *Syrian*, as not
 having the *Ephesian* Archives at hand to con-
 sult,

Irenæus
 3. c. 2.

fult, whereby they might soon have discovered
 the interpolations of the *Ebionians* from the
 genuine words of *St. Matthew*. It could not
 be expected, that in so short a compass of
 time true Copies enough should be distributed
 to answer the publick occasions; however,
 we find, that when once good stores of them
 were dispersed abroad, very few of the Ca-
 tholicks cited the spurious additions of the
Ebionians, at least they did not cite them,
 as formerly, for the true words of *St. Mat-
 thew*. Those that lived before, neither name
 the Authors of the Gospels, to whom they
 appeal, neither do they quote their Testi-
 monies, so as we read them in our Gospels,
 altho' they treat of the same matters, as ours
 do; but for the most part they cite the
 words out of other Gospels, that were after-
 wards condemn'd. Now I desire to be in-
 formed, what should be the reason of this,
 but that the Canon of the Gospels was esta-
 blished by the *Ephesian College*, and as
 such readily embraced and received
 by all Churches? I am of opinion
 too, that there might be this farther design
 in lodging them in the publick Archives, to
 make them obtain the force of Laws in the
 Christian Church. Thus the suffrages of the
Athenians acquired the Authority of Laws,
 so soon as they were lodged in the Temple of
Cybele, and the Decrees of the *Roman Senate*
 challenged the same power, when they were
 repositied in the Treasury of *Saturn*. Thence
 we find *το ἐκείνου νόμος*, a Law, which every
 one was to observe, *Esther* 1. 8. in the afore-
 said,

said signification of the word. And thus St. Bartholomew must needs have lived after these times, if it be true, that he brought the Hebrew and not the Ebionean Text of St. Matthew into India. As these Archives were older than Marcion, I am of opinion, they detected the interpolations he had inserted into the Gospel of St. Luke, as Tertullian and Epiphanius inform us, and the like villainous impostures practised by the Followers of Artemon, which no less differ'd from one another, than they did from the Authentick Texts of the Archives. Otherwise we can hardly imagine, that the Catholics wou'd have agreed so unanimously against them in those Texts, that were so lately received into the use of the Orthodox. According to this reckoning therefore the Episcopat will be earlier, than the modern Canon of the Gospels, and yet not lower than A. D. 107. For I am inclined to believe, that these new expeditions of the Christians are to be placed at the same time, with the first Colonies, that were sent into the Conquer'd Provinces of India, or at least with the first commerce, the Roman Subjects had with these vanquished people. We shall not, as I imagine, wander mightily out of our way, if we date the institution of the Episcopat from A. D. 106, so that it might have been a few years, either older or younger than that.

As I have already maintain'd, 'tis certain, that all this happen'd before St. Ignatius suffer'd, tho' the generality of Authors are

Euseb. Hist.
Eccl. l. 5.
28.

XXVIII.

The Martyrdom of
Ignatius
A. D. 112
or 114.

agreed, that he was Crowned with Martyrdom under *Trajan*; but in what year this fell out, is a very difficult matter to determine, especially under so great a Scarcity of Memoirs. His own Epistles put it beyond all dispute, that he was sent from *Syria* to *Rome*, in order to suffer death there, and confirm the truth of what the *Acts* agree in, viz. that he was not sent thither by the Prefect of *Syria*, but by the Emperour himself. His Name, which seems to be derived from that of the *Egnatian* Family, shows him to have been a *Roman* Citizen belonging to the Colony of *Antioch*. The Governour could not inflict Capital punishments upon a *Roman* Citizen, without consulting the Emperour, much less Sentence him to any such punishment, as should affect him with servile pain, and make him forfeit his Benefit of the City; and surely condemning a Man to be thrown to wild Beasts, is a punishment of that nature. But much less could the Prefect or Governour Sentence him to be punished without the limits of his Province, and yet that this was the Punishment he was condemn'd to suffer, his celebrated Epistle to the *Romans* sufficiently shews. Therefore 'tis probable from other Memoirs, besides the *Acts*, that *Trajan* was at *Antioch*, when this Sentence passed upon *Ignatius*. Now *Trajan* was twice at *Antioch*, first of all, when he undertook his first expedition against the *Parthians*, because they had disposed of the Kingdom of *Armenia*, without consulting him in that Affair, viz. *A. D.* 112. and this

we may gather from the *Latin Acts*, and particularly those in the *Cotton Library*, which testify, that *Trajan* was then upon his march towards *Armenia* and *Parthia*; for 'tis evident out of *Dion*, that the Actions of his first expedition were perform'd in *Armenia*. Indeed *Malela*, a fellow Citizen of *Ignatius*, as being a Native of *Antioch*, relates it differently, taking his accounts, as may be presumed, out of the *Paschal Fasti* of *Antioch*. Now he reports, that *Ignatius* suffer'd Martyrdom at the same time, that the great Earth-quake happen'd at *Antioch*, *Trajan* himself being then in the City. *Dion* places this Earth-quake in *Pedo's* Councilship, *Malela* assigns it to the second year of *Trajan's* coming into the East. But that both these accounts fall upon, A. D. 114, I think I have shown in another place. Which of these two Opinions is the truer, I am not able to determine, for I think there's no great credit to be given to the *Paschal Canons* of *Antioch*, even in their own Affairs, altho' we had a more accurate and Faithful transcriber of them than *Malela* was. If *Malela's* accounts are true, the first opinion, which flatly contradicts them, must certainly be false; for *Malela* makes *Trajan* leave *Rome* in *October*, and not to have reach'd *Antioch* before the Month of *December*: Now, that *Ignatius* in the Month of *August* at least, was upon his Journey thither, his own Epistle to the *Romans* sufficiently shews. In *Pedo's* Consulship the Emperour pass'd the better part of the Year in *Antioch*. Either of the

Præf. Cambd.

two, I look upon to be true, or at least very probable ; But follow which of the two accounts you will, it will be later than the Martyrdom of *Simeon*, the destruction of the Church of *Jerusalem*, which despoil'd it of its primacy, and the Epoch of the Institution of the *Episcopat*.

XXV.
The Writ-
ings of Ig-
natius, suit-
ed to this
time. No
mention in
him of the
Church of
Jerusalem
which was
now destroy-
ed. His
Commenda-
tion of the
Epis-
copat then
very season-
able.

And to say the truth, his Epistles wonderfully confirm this, which were all written by him, when he had a near prospect of Martyrdom. We find not the least mention of the Church of *Jerusalem* in them, as being overwhelm'd, dissipated, and incapable of maintaining its former Dignity. Had matters stood otherwise, he had hardly sought out a patronage for his own Church of *Antioch* elsewhere, since *Judea* and the City of *Jerusalem* used to be reckon'd in the Province of *Syria*. Not to take notice, that the remembrance of its Primacy was still fresh in peoples Minds, which wou'd have recommended its Authority above that of any other Church whatever, if any power had been left it, amidst so many terrible Shocks and Tumults. This makes it evident, that *Ignatius* is by no means to be charged with Affectation, which Crime, the Adversaries of his Epistles, who seem to be utterly unacquainted with our reasons, are pleased to lay at his Door, since it was absolutely necessary, that the *πρωτοκαθεδρος* should be asserted with all the force and vigour imaginable. This single Controversie was of more importance than all the rest, for upon it depended the whole fabrick of Ecclesiastical Discipline, as well

well relating to Faith as to Manners. Could any more speedy and effectual Method be thought of to extinguish all Heresies, whether known or unknown, and all Schisms whatever, than that the faithful should preserve an inviolable Communion with their Bishops in their respective Districts? Surely this was a more Compendious, as well as Efficacious Way, than if he had spent his time in tracing out every particular Heresie, and afterwards in refuting it. And yet 'tis a more tedious and lasting piece of Drudgery to discover and examine every skulking Heresie, than to give a due Commendation of the Episcopal Power: Besides such a Conduct can only be serviceable to deter people from Heresies already known, let us suppose the Author to have detected and refuted them never so successfully: And after all, 'tis an endless Labour to unearth every lurking Heresie, and to provide against those, that are yet unborn; all which Trouble might easily be spared, if Men were taught to prefer the Communion of their own Bishops, as being the same with that of the Apostles, to all Communions whatever, whether known or unknown. Thus we find, that such a procedure is of a more universal and extended advantage, than to Attack and Defeat all erroneous Doctrines by Retail. Now this Reason will hold Eternally good in all Ages of the World, tho' it was more adapted to the Exigence of that time, than any other; for upon the first devolution of this Power upon the Bishops, it was more necessary to assert and

and urge it to the World, it being in a manner unknown: But when once it was fully established and received, then it might be deduced down to Posterity, without any new Recommendation. Now I have sufficiently shown, that this Power of the Bishops was but in its Infancy, when *Ignatius* undertook the Defence of it, the former jurisdiction of the Church of *Jerusalem* being wholly extinct and abolished. And in this Sense the *νέτερον τάξις*, or *New Regulation* of *Ignatius*, as our Adversaries wou'd have it, might well enough be understood; if there were any Necessity for it; but the learned *Pearson* has demonstrated, that we need not put this Construction upon *Ignatius's* Words: Therefore unless some new power had been substituted into its room, the whole Discipline of the Church had been intirely ruin'd, and all sorts of Rebels, as well as Hereticks, as Schismatics, and prophane impious Offenders, might have trampled upon it at pleasure. Thus there was a Necessity to urge and maintain this new Power, till it was every where acknowledged by such as were subject to it, and till Men were accustomed to obey it. Now all this exactly agrees with the Exigence of these Times.

XXVI. And indeed *Ignatius* expresses himself after such a manner, as became one to speak, who had this design in his view. He recommends the *Unity of the Flesh*, as well as that of the *Spirit of Jesus Christ*, to the *Magnesians*, c. 1. He calls the true Faith *The Flesh of our Lord*, to the *Trall*, c. 8. hereby meaning,

Ignatius writes so. as if he had before his Eyes what we have been talking of.

ing, that we ought to stick to the Faith, as to the Flesh of our Lord. Thus likewise concerning the Gospel, *Cleaving fast to the Gospel, as to the Flesh of our Lord.* We may easily perceive, that in these Passages he alludes to the received Opinion, which taught People formerly to adhere to the Church of *Jerusalem* for the sake of *our Lord's flesh*, while any of his *Kinsmen* were to be found in it. He sometimes compares the Presbyteries of his time with the first and supreme Apostolical College of the *Jerusalem Clergy*: *The Bishop sitting in the place of God, and the Elders in the place of the Sanedrim of the Apostles: to the Magnes. c. 6. Be subject also to the Presbytery, as to the Apostles of Jesus Christ, who is our hope: to the Trall. c. 2. And again below: The Presbyters, as the Sanedrim of God, and the bond of the Apostles, c. 3.* Now to what purpose speaks he this, but to let the World understand, that the Supreme Power of the Apostolical Sanedrim of *Jerusalem* was then lodged in the respective Presbyteries? Pursuant to this Doctrine he thus declares himself to those of *Smyrna*: *Follow the Bishop, all of you, even as Jesus Christ followed the Father, and the Presbytery, as the Apostles. to the Smyrn, c. 8.* So likewise on the other Hand he teaches, that the very same Respect is to be paid to the Apostles, which was due to the Presbytery of the Church: *And to the Apostles, as to the Presbytery of the Church. to the Philadelph. c. 5.* This very passage is sufficient to demonstrate

monstrate, that the Presbyteries of his time made a far greater Figure, than the Presbytery of *Jerusalem* did, at least while the Apostles were Living: For the Presbyters then made up the second College, which was subject to the Apostles: But now not only the Presbyters of *Jerusalem*, but those of foreign Churches, were accounted equal to the Apostles. Thus we saw just now the *Συνεδριον*, or the Sanedrim of God used to signify the Presbytery. Our Author makes mention of the *Συνεδριον* *Επισκοπου*, or Bishop's Sanedrim, to the *Philadelph.* c. 8. So that now all other Christian Churches, except that of *Jerusalem*, enjoy'd all the Rights and Privileges of the Sanedrim: And indeed *Ignatius* asserts all those Rights, which formerly belonged to the Apostolical Church of *Jerusalem*, to every Bishop in conjunction with his Presbytery. He looks upon it to be the proper Office of an Apostle *διατάξαι*, to appoint, or regulate, as well as the Author of the modern *διατάξαι*, to the *Trall.* c. 3. From hence these Words of his, *I don't regulate as an Apostle.* He teaches submission to the Bishop, and his Injunctions; for so he expresses himself in his Epistle to the *Trall:* *being inseparable from our Lord Jesus Christ, and from the Bishop, and from the Injunctions and Constitutions of the Apostles,* c. 7. Nay, he intimates in the former place, that himself, as being a Bishop, is not without that power, altho', out of Modesty he declines the Envy of it, because he was not an Apostle. *Clemens Romanus* has observed with what wonderful

derful nicety and caution all the sacred Cere- *Clem. Rom. Epist. ad Cor. c. 41.*
monies were administred at *Jerusalem*, under the care of the High Priest, least he shou'd incur a Sin that was to be aton'd for. *Ignatius* intimates the same, affirming, that if any one took any Ecclesiastical Office, of what kind soever, upon him, without consulting the Bishop before hand, he was impure, because he had acted contrary to his Conscience, to the *Trallians*, c. 7. Neither was this to be looked upon as the Worshipping of God (to the *Smyrneans*, c. 9.) but the Devil, and consequently most ungrateful to him, and deserving an Expiation. And all this, upon the account of the Law of God, which being to be learnt at *Jerusalem*, made it be called the Holy City, in preference to all others, even by the Canonical Christian Writers of the New Testament, and was the Reason, why God chiefly manifested himself there in his Punishments. For God received all Holy Things into his own Patronage; and the holier any thing was accounted, so much the speedier and severer Vengeance was to be taken on those, that had violated it. The Hellenistical Writers call the Law *νόμος*, or the Command; and in imitation of their Style the Writers of the New Testament use the same Expression. After the Example of both these, *St. Ignatius* owns the same of the Bishops of his time, at least with the Presbyteries subject to them. To the *Magnesians*: Subject to the Bishop, as to the Grace of God, and to the Presbytery, as to the Law of Jesus Christ, c. 2. In this place *Ignatius* asserts the Rights of both

both the *Sanedrims* of *Jerusalem*, as well the Jewish, as the Christian, to his Bishops: After the same manner, as the Holy Evangelist *St. John* 1. 17. opposes and prefers *Grace* to the *Law*. And to the *Trallians*: being subject to the Bishop, as to the *Law* [or *Commandment*] and likewise to the *Presbytery*, c. 13. 'Tis plain he imitates the *Stile* of *Jerusalem* in both these places, and probably with this Design, to let them know, that the same Punishments, which the violaters of the *Law* and *Commandment* were to expect from God in *Jerusalem*, under the inspection of the High Priest, or Bishop of that City, ought to be dreaded in other Churches, if any Man, who was under the Government of his Bishop, rebell'd against the New Law of the Gospel, which was to be written in the Heart. Thus 'twas a received Custom with the Jews in their Disputes with the *Samaritans*, to own no other Meetings as legal and valid, but such as were kept at *Jerusalem* under the High Priest of that City: That only those Sacrifices were pleasing to God, and that only those annual Assemblies at the *Passoever*, the *Pentecost*, and the Feast of *Tabernacles*, were to be looked upon as a due observing of the Law, and to be rewarded with those Blessings, that were promised to such, as observed it: But that if any one offer'd Sacrifices elsewhere, or celebrated the Festivals enjoyn'd by the Law elsewhere, he by no means satisfied the Law, neither cou'd he expect the Rewards promised to the fulfillers of it by God the Lawgiver: And consequently, that all

all these things were null and void, if perform'd in any other place, than *Jerusalem*. Our Blessed Lord himself owns all these things to be true in his Discourse with the Woman of *Samaria*: For in this sense are these words to be understood; *Salvation is of the Jews*, St. John 4. 22. Because the Salvation promised to the chosen Flock was annexed to those solemn Sacrifices and Assemblies, that were celebrated in *Jerusalem*, and not to those upon Mount *Gerizim*. Thus, even those very Ceremonies, that were strictly enjoyn'd by the Law, became insignificant, and forfeited all pretence to a Reward, if kept in any other place, than what was prescribed by the Law. This gives us some light towards the Understanding of *Ignatius*, where he positively asserts that those meetings, which broke off Communion with their Bishop, were not *βεβαια*, or *valid*; for thus he writes to the *Magnesians*: *Such persons seem not to me to carry good Consciences, because they don't meet βεβαια, i. e. Regularly, or Orthodoxly, according to the Command*. He means that all such Meetings, in the strict interpretation of the Law, were illegal, and therefore deserved not the benefits of Lawful Assemblies. He affirms the same of the Eucharistical Sacrifice of the New Covenant in his Epistle to the *Smyrneans*; *Let that Sacrifice of Thanksgiving be esteemed βεβαια, i. e. valid, which is either perform'd under the Bishop, or by his order by another*. Now what he means by his *Εὐχαριστία βεβαια*, he plainly shews in his Epistle to the *Ephesians*: *Unless a Man is within the Altar, he is deprived of*

the

the bread of God. From this place 'tis evident, that in *Ignatius's* Opinion, that only is the true and proper Eucharist which makes us partakers of the Heavenly one. As all this is exprest in the very Language of *Jerusalem*, so it asserts the Rights of that Church to all other Churches. But it may be objected, that these are only Consequences drawn out of his Writings, tho' fair and obvious. Well then, let us come to more open and direct Proofs. Every one knows, that the High-Priest of the Jews, and after him the Bishop of *Jerusalem*, challenged by a peculiar Right to be the principle of the Mystical Union, as being President of that only Altar, which was granted to the Jews no where, but at *Jerusalem*, for the sake of their Sacrifices. Thus * *Iosephus* speaking in the person of his Legislator; *In the other Cities let there be neither Altar, nor Temple; for God is one, and the race of the Hebrews is one.* He had instructed them before, that even in the Holy City it self, it was not lawful to have more Temples, or more Altars: *Let there, says he, be but one Temple, and one Altar there.* The reason of which was, because the High Priest of the Jews, as * *Philo* informs us, was supposed to represent the $\alpha\beta\gamma\delta$, as the Original High Priest; and from hence they infer'd, that as they were made partakers of the Sacrifices offer'd by the High Priest; so by the benefit of the Divine compact they might become partakers of the Heavenly Sacrifices offer'd by the $\alpha\beta\gamma\delta$, and of the Unity, and Holy Commerce with the $\alpha\beta\gamma\delta$, and his Father; but on the other hand

Antiqu.
l. 4. c. 8.

* Migratio
Abrahami
p. 404. De
Prologis,
p. 466.

and, that they were to be excluded from the Benefits of the Heavenly Sacrifices, if ever they alienated themselves from the Sacrifices of the High Priest. Nor do the Apostles argue otherwise in the case of the Church of *Jerusalem*. Thus St. *John* the Apostle: *That ye also may have fellowship with us; and truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ*. We have already observed, that there was a *κοινωνία*, or Fellowship of Cities, and consequently, that this exactly suits with the Church of *Jerusalem*: And St. *Paul* teaches us, that there was a Fellowship of Sacrifices, *1. Cor. 10.* As well *Jewish*, v. 18. as *Gentile*, v. 20. and *Eucharistical*, v. 16. 21. Thus *Ignatius* sometimes compares the Bishop with God the Father, who being the Head of Christ, is consequently the chief principle of Unity. To the *Ephesians*: *Let us take care not to disobey the Bishop, that we may be subject to God*, c. 5. To the *Smyrneans*: *'Tis a good thing to know God and the Bishop: He that honours the Bishop is honoured of God*, c. 9. Thus to the *Trallians*: *And the Bishop, as him who is the figure of the Father*. This passage is otherwise read in the Modern Greek, but is to be thus amended out of *Antiochus* and the Interpolator. To the *Magnesians*: *The Bishop sitting in the place of God*, c. 6. Sometimes he compares him to Christ himself, the *ἀόρατος*. To the *Ephesians*: *'Tis therefore manifest, that we ought to look upon the Bishop as our Lord*. To the *Smyrneans*: *Wherever the Bishop appears, there let the multitude be, as*

where *Jesus Christ* is, there is the *Catholic Church*, c. 8. And in the matter of *Unity*, he ascribes all to the *Bishop*; nay, he joyns the *Unity* of *God* with the *Bishop's Sanedrim*. To the *Philadelphians*: *Therefore our Lord forgives all that Repent, provided they Repent to the Unity of God, and the Sanedrim of the Bishop*, c. 8. And in the same *Epistle* yet more expresly: *Endeavour therefore to partake of one Eucharist, for one is the flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one Cup towards the Unity of his Blood: One Altar, as one Bishop, with the Presbytery and Deacons my fellow Servants; that whatever you do, you may do it after God's Will*, c. 4. And to the *Magnesians*, having advised them, that nothing was to be done without the *Bishop* and his *Presbyters*; a little after he subjoyns these words: *There is one Jesus Christ, than whom nothing is more excellent; therefore run all of you together, as it were to one Temple of the Lord, as it were to one Altar, and one Jesus Christ proceeding from one Father*, &c. c. 7. 'Tis plain therefore he means by this one Temple, and this one Altar the one *Eucharistical Sacrifice* of every *Bishop*. He concludes, that by this one Sacrifice, we are likewise admitted to the *Mystical Unity* with one *Christ*, and with one *Father*. And in this sense is to be understood the following passage: *The Bishops, that determine the boundaries, are of our Lord's Opinion, to the Ephesians*, c. 3. For the *Holy Scriptures* use the same expression, viz. *μία ἑνωσις*, of such, as preserve *Concord* and *Unity* among themselves

selves. I am apt to believe, that this form of speaking is borrowed from the *Roman Senate*. For there were some Senators, that had a right of giving their Votes, and declaring their Opinion in their own Words: This Opinion in Greek is called *γνώμη*; and so likewise is the person, who brought it in Writing to the Senate. There were also other Senators, that had no right to give their Opinion; but when the House came to be divided, then they went over to the Opinion of others. These were the *Pedarij*, of whom *A. Gellius* makes mention in his *Noctes Atticae*, l. 3. c. 18. Now these were supposed to be of the same *γνώμη* with him, whose Sentence they approved by going over to his Party. And therefore *Ignatius's* meaning must be, that there was no room in the Church for different Opinions concerning matters of Faith, but that all were obliged to assent to what Christ had appointed. Thus we read of *ὁμόθυτος γνώμη*, or an *Unanimous Consent*, 2. Macc. 11. 20. Thus likewise in the Inscription of his Epistle to the *Philadelphians*, he styles their Bishop with his Presbyters and Deacons, *approved in the Opinion of Christ*. To these he opposes such, as walked *ἐν ἄλλοτριᾷ γνώμῃ*, in a different Opinion, c. 3. and acted contrary to *τῇ γνώμῃ*, the Opinion, or Will of God: But in that first passage to the *Ephesians* he asserts, that all these things belong to all the Bishops in the World; from whence 'tis evident, that the Apostles left them all equal to one another. I cannot but remark *en passant*, that the genuineness of these

Epistles is sufficiently confirmed by so many places, that are so exactly suited to the Humour and Genius of those times. He must have been a very dexterous Impostor indeed, that could so handsomely counterfeit the Language and Doctrine of this Age, the very remembrance of which was in a manner lost within a few Centuries after *Christ*.

XXVII. In the middle space between *Simeon's* death and the Martyrdom of *Ignatius*, there happen'd another remarkable turn in the affairs of the Church which was, that the Name of *Bishop*, heretofore common to others, became now peculiar only to the *Προσεδρεσς*. *Ignatius* honours none but such with this Title, and so cautiously distinguishes them from the Presbyters, that he never owns more than one Bishop in every Church. 'Tis true, that even under the Apostles there were *Προσεδρεσς*, or Chief Seats in the Sanedrims of the Jews, as the Holy * Scriptures inform us: and that there were the like among the Christians, in other places too besides *Jerusalem*, we find by that Apostolical Writer *Heremias's* Pastor, *L. 1. Vis. 3. N. 9*. For the ambitious seeking after and affectation of this Chief Seat is condemn'd by the latter as well as the former. But the Names were so confusedly mingled, that the Presbyters were as well call'd *Προσεδρεσς*, as on the other hand the Name of *Bishop* was attributed to the Presbyters of the inferior Seats. But those Christian Writers that appear'd after *Ignatius* observe a most nice and religious distinction between the two Names. Now if this distinction had ow'd its

rise

Why together with the Power the Name likewise of Bishop was so soon received in the chief Seats better accounted for by our Hypothesis, than by that affection of the first place, to which the Presbyterians ascribe it.

* St. Matt. 23. 6. St. Mark 12. 29. S. Luke 11. 43. & 20. 46.

rise to the usurpation of the Hierarchy, as the *Presbyterians* wou'd have it, I can't imagine how within so short a compass of time it had the good luck to prevail so universally. For what reply can they make? Will they confess that there were *Pompey's*, lovers of the highest places, that cou'd endure no *equals*; and will they not at the same time own there were *Cæsar's* in the Presbyteries, that were full as impatient to have any *Superior*? Had these Contentions and Disputes happen'd between the two parties, consider I beseech you, what a horrid scandal this must have given to the *Jews* and *Gentiles*, and how fatally detrimental it must have prov'd to the common Welfare of Christianity? And yet we find not the least foot-step of Scandal given by these Disorders, and so far was our holy Religion from receiving any detriment, that on the other hand the Christian Faith extended it self to the remotest parts of the Universe in this very period of time we are talking of; Heresies were stifled in the cradle, Expeditions undertaken in *Trajan's* Reign for the Propagation of the Gospel, and the Discipline of the Church never so flourishing and vigorous as towards the middle of this Century. Suppose the *Presbyters* of two or three Cities did patiently submit to the Yoke, yet who can imagine that they were of the same passive complexion all the World over? Had never so few of them joyn'd to assert their common Liberties, what profound Reasons will our Adversaries find out to shew why the *Presbyters* were always beaten out of the Field, and the *New*.

condemned, always came off Conquerors? especially since the latter had no power in their hands to force those to obey them, that were refractory. 'Tis nonsense to say, there lay any obligation upon their Consciences, if the others had no rightful title to shew for their pretensions. Neither can we say it was effected by the violence of many Cities combin'd together, nor by any inherent authority in them, since the Churches of *Jerusalem* and *Ephesus* had lost their Privileges. He that can easily believe so astonishing and universal a success, and that too wrought in so narrow a space of time, to be owing to the Politics of some few ambitious Persons, and that at the same time all the *Presbyteries* in the Universe were either fast asleep, or gave way to these Usurpations; such a Man, I say, may digest all the absurdities in Nature, and believe the World to have been produc'd by the fortuitous concurrence of Atoms, according to the *Epicurean Hypothesis*. This difficulty would be much easier to account for, by pretending that these *Pejorateds* had no new Power, but only a new Name given them; were it not that we find them distinguish'd by something more than a new Name. 'Tis certain, that their Rights, if we may depend upon *Ignatius*, were infinitely greater than our *Presbyterians* would endure in their *Moderators*: To instance in no more than this important Point, *viz.* That the Bishop's Communion was still to be prefer'd, notwithstanding the Major number of the *Presbyters* oppos'd it, and

and that if even this Majority embraced any other Communion, than that of the Bishop, they were not to expect the Benefits of Communion. Therefore they must either suppose, that this right of the *Πρωτοκαθεδρε* was of ancients date, than the Name of *Bishop* became peculiar to that Order, or else that they acquired it at the same time with their new Name. If the first, 'tis easy to account for the giving them this new Name; but the mischief on't is, that our Adversaries will gain nothing by this: for while they own the thing signified by the Name to be ancient, 'twill be meer Impertinence to squabble about the Name. But if they shall pretend that the thing together with the Name was changed, the abovemention'd difficulties will again crowd upon us; as how it was possible for so great a change to be carried on in so many places at once, and that in the space of so few years, especially being destitute of both Right and Force to support it, and likely to meet so much opposition from the oppress'd Party? Now our *Hypothesis* will furnish us with an easy reason, how this change of the Name came to prevail in all places, and that in so short a time; for since the Rights of the Church of *Jerusalem* legally devolved upon these *Πρωτοκαθεδρε*, what occasion was there for any one to oppose them; nay, on the other hand, were not all good Men obliged in conscience to allow and maintain them? But this Right of the Principle of Unity could not possibly belong to the whole Body, but only to the Head of that Body,

and consequently to a single Person. The very Intention of a Chief Seat excluded all Rivals and Competitors whatever. Neither could any just Exception be made to their Persons, whom the aforesaid Devolution found settled in the Chief Seats by the last Itinerary Ministers of the Apostolical Church of *Jerusalem*. There was no reason therefore to doubt, but that these Persons, whom that Apostolical Church had judged worthy of the Chief Seat among their own People, were likewise thought worthy by them of the Rights that were hereafter to devolve upon the Chief Seats. There is no *Mystery of Iniquity* in all this, but on the other hand every thing exactly conformable to the Approbation of the Apostolical Church, as far as we can guess at it by what happen'd before. Neither did this Devolution of ours depend upon the Motions of particular Churches, which might have been attended with various Events, according to the variety of Places and Men. The entire destruction of the Church of *Jerusalem* was of it self a reason sufficient, that the devolution of that ancient Right should fall upon all the Churches of the World, and their *Παροικίες*: And so by this means an accession of new Power might at last come to them. Nor have we any reason to wonder if the new Name of a new, but an Acknowledged and Legal Power was afterwards receiv'd in all places without any hesitation or clamor. And this seems to me the easiest, as well as the truest way of accounting for a Fact so manifest of it self.

Let us now examine how they came to
pitch

pitch upon this Name of *Ἐπίσκοπος* or *Bi-*
shop to signifie that new power; for I have
 not hitherto observed, that this subject has
 been so thoroughly handled and explained as
 it deserves. As for the *Ἐπίσκοποι*, or Pre-
 fects of the *Attick* Cities, 'tis plain, we
 have nothing to do with them here. If any
Hellenisms crept amongst those of *Jerusalem*,
 they may thank the *Macedonians*, those
 Conquerors of the World, who were Orig-
 inally *Derians*, for them, and not the *Athe-*
nians. But I don't find, that the *Macedoni-*
ans ever used the Word in this Signification,
 and as for the *Athenians*, they had lost the use
 of the Word long before, together with their
 Foreign acquisitions. They had no Cities
 abroad that owned their Jurisdiction, and
 over whom they cou'd place these *Ἐπίσκοποι*
 neither under the *Roman* Empire, nor yet,
 when they were subject to the *Macedonians*.
 This use of the Word therefore cou'd not
 possibly be taken any where else, than out of
 the Books of the *Athenians*, with which the
Jews had no manner of commerce; So
 that they cou'd not borrow Words from them
 that were daily used by the Government
 then received. Much less does that *Episcopa-*
tus mentioned by *Cicero*, whereby *Pompey*
 made him Prefect of the maritime Coast of
Campania, signifie any thing towards the Ec-
 clestialical use of the Word. The Word, as
 'tis employed in that Signification, has no
 relation to Cities, tho' 'tis plain, the Ec-
 clestialical use of the word makes it peculiar to
 them. For my part I am of opinion, that the sig-
 nification of the word is to be fetch'd elsewhere.

XXVIII.

The Name
 of Bishop in
 its primary
 significati-
 on proper to
 God, from
 hence trans-
 fer'd to
 the Priests,
 especially
 those of the
 highest
 Rank.

The

The Providence of God is call'd *Ἐπισκοπή* as well that universal one, as that which is proper to every *Demon* or *Tutelar Genius*. Thus *Plutarch* in his *Life of Numa*, speaking of *Libitina*, makes her the *Ἐπισκοπὸς* *ἑσπερίας*, the Goddess, that inspected or Superintended the Funeral Obsequies for the Dead. He says of *Eilithyia*: Our Birth has *Ἐπισκοπὸν*, i.e. a Divine Inspectress that presides over Child bearing Women. in *Eroticis*. He calls the God *Terminus*, *Ἐπισκοπὸς οὐλίας καὶ εἰρήνης*, THE OVERSEER OF FRIENDSHIP AND PEACE. Again he speaks of *Libitina* *ibid.* as of the only Goddess *τὰς ψυχὰς καὶ τὰς ταφὰς Ἐπισκοπούσας*, that oversees Births and Burials. Thus the same Author in his *Treatise* shewing the reason, why the Oracles were no longer delivered in Verse, observes that *Simonides* call'd the Muse *Clio* *Ἐπισκοπὸς*. The same in *Cap. Rom.* mentions, *Δίον ἐπισκοπούσαν καὶ ἐφορούσαν*, an overlooking inspecting Goddess. So in his Book *de Fato*, *Ἐπισκοπὴ* is used in the same sense; and in his *Life of Camillus*: O great *Jupiter* and you Gods, *χρηστῶν Ἐπισκοποὶ καὶ πονηρῶν ἑστων*, the Overseers of Good and Wicked Works. He calls the Demons *Ἐπισκοποὶ θεῶν ἱερῶν*, the Overseers of Divine Sacrifices and Administrators of Mysteries. *de def. Orac.* Again in his Book *de Fato*: Demons appointed about the Earth, to be *φύλακες τε καὶ ἐπισκοποὶ*, the Guardians and Overseers of humane Actions. And in *Eroticis*: None of the Gods was a witness, or *Ἐπισκοπὸς*, an Overseer, or Leader, or a Cooperator with us. He also calls the bad Demons

* Τὴν μὲν
ἡ Δύσις
ἐπισκοπεῖ
Διόνυσος
καὶ ἡ Τέρ-
ψιχόρης καὶ
Θαλίς.

Demons Ἐπίσκοποι βίων καὶ οἰκῶν, *Overseers of Lives and Houses*. Thus the Chief God is call'd Πανἐπίσκοπος ἡμῶν, *the universal Inspector of us*, in the Sibylline Oracles. After the same manner is the Word used by Philo, who comes much nearer to the Stile of the New Testament, for he was a Jew, as well as the Apostles were before they embraced the Faith of Christ, and lived in the same age with them. Speaking therefore of the Departure of Abraham, he says: *These are thoughts*, ὅτι μόνος ὁ θεὸς ἐπίσκοπος, *of whom God alone is the Inspector*, p. 400. and afterwards, *ibid.* Ὅτις ἐν ψυχῇ ταμιδωμένων ἐπίσκοπος, *Inspector of those things that are repositied in the Soul*, p. 405. And in the same Author Moses says: *I will stretch out my hands and confess all my Actions to God, the witness of the Good and Ἐπίσκοπος, or Overseer of each.* de Leg. Alleg. l. 2. p. 68. This therefore is the primary signification of the Word, as far as it concerns our present disquisition, and from hence it descended to others, who represented the Person of God, but especially to Priests, and other intimate Friends of God, in which number were the Priests above the People, and particularly the chief Priests of all. Thus Plutarch calls the *Augurs* Ἐπίσκοποι καὶ φύλακες, 1. 3. *The Overseers and keepers of the Divinatory Art borrowed from Birds and Prodigies*. After the same manner as we observed the Ἐπισκόπος, καὶ φύλακες, to be joyn'd together before, in Relation to the Gods. Now it appears, from Dion and other Writers that the *Augurs* were

were reckon'd among the Priests. He that came nearest to the Example of the High Priest among the *Jews*, and consequently of the Christian Bishops, was the *Pontifex Maximus* or Chief Pontiff of the *Romans*, who was above all the other Priests. *Plutarch* applies this very word to him, and describes him after such a manner, as if he had been describing a *Christian Bishop*. τὸς ἰδὲ δούλους ἘΠΙΣΚΟΠΩΝ, *Sc. supervising those that sacrificed aright, prohibiting what was appointed by Law to be transgressed, and teaching whatever was necessary for worshipping the Gods, or deprecating their Anger.* He was also ὁ ἱερῶν παρθένων ἐπισκοπῶν, *Supervisor of the Holy Maids, whom they call the Vestal Virgins.* Here he places the Vestal Virgins under the cognisance of the Ἐπίσκοπος, who we know were chastised by the *Pontifex Maximus* if they committed any oversight in the Sacred rites committed to their charge. We therefore see, after what Example the *Christian Virgins* were intrusted to the Bishop's inspection, after they had formed themselves into separate Societies. In the same place *Plutarch* joyns together the Offices of *Episcopus* and *Doctor*, as he has done in the *Life of Lycurgus*, where we find the following passage, Ἐπισκοπῶντες τὰς παῖδας, καὶ διδασκῶντες τι αὐτὰ χρησίμους, i.e. *Overseeing the Youth, and teaching them something useful.* For the Chief Priests used to teach the younger Priests, as *Gellius* informs us, that the junior Vestal Virgins were instructed by the oldest of that Society in the last ten years of their Function. But chiefly

chiefly the *Pontifex Maximus* did this, who was not only Superior to the Priests of his own Order, but likewise to all of that Sacred Employment, nay, and inspected the private Sacrifices and Rites. He also pronounced their Vows and led up those that Sung the Sacred Verses, although they were Laics. We find in *Livy*, that he did this when the first *Decius* devoted himself, and in other solemn Vows of the Magistrates. By this it appears, how justly the Apostle joyn'd the Office of Teaching to the received Signification of the Word *Episcopus*. The Scholiast of *Aristophanes* in his Notes upon the *Nubes* calls the *Pylagora*, who offer'd the common Sacrifices of all *Greece* in the *Amphiſtyonian* Council, by the name of ἐπίσκοποι, or *Bishops*. *Philo* bestows the like Signification upon the Word, calling *Abraham* himself Ἐπίσκοπος, as being privy to the Divine Secrets, which properly belonged to the Priests. Upon the same account he applies the very same Word to the high Priest of the *Jews*. *l. de Temulentia*. He is intrusted, says he, once a year to enter and, Ἐπισκοπεῖν ἀθέατα ἄλλοις, to oversee the things, which 'tis lawful for no one else to behold, p. 260. Therefore the use of this word perhaps came from the High Priest of the *Jews*, and the Sanhedrim of *Jerusalem*, to the chief Order at least of the Christian Clergy of that City, but especially to the President of that order. We find the word Ἐπισκοπή, applied to the Apostolical Office in the holy Writers; and the Author of

*Lib. de.
rer. diu.
Hæred.
p. 485.*

of the supposititious Pieces, that goe under the name of *Clemens*, might borrow his notion perhaps from Writers of good credit, and ancients than himself, that now are lost, when he call'd St. *James* the Bishop of Bishops. As that Author writes more like a Poet, than an Historian (tho' at the same time it must be confessed, he lived at no great distance from the Apostolical Age) so he suits his Language to the decorum of those times. So then, if St. *James* was call'd Bishop in his own proper right, the name might well enough devolve from him to the *Πρωτοκαθεδρε* of other Churches, after the same manner, as we have shown the other rights belonging formerly to the Church of *Jerusalem* to have devolved upon them.

XXIX.
Ignatius
says the
same, and
the Holy
Scriptures
before him.

Ignatius, and the Christians his Contemporaries hold the same concerning the primary signification of this Word, namely, that it properly belongs to God, and not to Men, and to God, as he is the principle of the Mystick unity. For this reason in his Epistle to *Polycarp* he joyns the Unity of God and the Episcopate: *I pray, that you may be always confirmed in our Lord Jesus Christ, in whom abide in the Unity of God, and the ενομενω, or Episcopate.* For so the Florence M. S. reads it, and Bishop *Usher's* Latin Interpreter of the genuine *Ignatius*, and not *επισκοπος*, as the *Augsburg* Manuscript has it. The Holy Scriptures denote that Mystical Unity by one Head, so that only those can be said to be one, who belong to one common Head. But the writers of the New Testa-

ment

ment mean only two Persons of the Trinity under the Name of *Head*. For as the Man is the head of the Woman, so Christ is the Head of the Man, and God the head of Christ. But the Holy Ghost is rather the Bond of Unity, than the Head of it. 'Tis certain, that this Unity, which is attributed to God, is taken from the unity of Matrimony, because the Writers both of the Old and New Testament represent God as a Husband, and the chosen Flock as his Spouse. But the Holy Ghost is in no part of the Bible called the Husband of the Peculium. Indeed to carry on the Matrimonial Metaphor, the Holy Ghost is not called a Husband, but the *Earneſt*, or the *Antenuptial present*, 2 Cor. c. 1. 22. c. 5. 5. *Ephes.* 1. 13. and 14. for he is often call'd a *Gift*. In likemanner *Ignatius* ascribes the Episcopate to these two persons of the Trinity: To the Father, in his Epistle to the *Magnesian*, where telling them, that 'tis their Duty to obey *Damas* their Bishop: *and not him*, says he, *but the Father of Jesus Christ the Bishop or ἐπίσκοπος of all*. Thus likewise in his Epistle to the *Trallians* c. 3. he tells them, that *the Bishop is the figure of the Father*. I make no question, but that his most excellent Interpreter published by Bishop *Usher* did find it *ἐπίσκοπος* in the Copies of his time, and indeed *Ignatius* uses the word *ἐπίσκοπος* in the same sense in another place. Therefore in his abovementioned Epistle to the *Magnesian* he makes *the Father the invisible Bishop*, and opposes him to the *Visible* one. The Vi-
fible

fible Bishop is the same with him, that is *Bishop in the Flesh*, c. 1. after the same manner, as these two expressions *πρὸς σάρκα*, to the *Flesh*, and *πρὸς θεόν*, to *God* are opposed in the aforesaid Epistle to the *Magnesians*: *The Word is not to the Flesh, but to God, who knows all hidden things*, c. 3. where he is upon his old Argument of paying Obedience to the Bishop, The same Author ascribes the Episcopat to the Son, where he teaches, that the Bishop is to be honoured with the same respect *ὡς αὐτὸν κύριον*, as the *Lord himself*; for after the same manner does the Apostle likewise distinguish between God and the

(a) Philo Lord, and (a) Philo, who was contemporary to the Apostles, does it likewise, pursuant to his Hellenistical Hypothesis. But indeed Philo so distinguishes between them, that he rather believed two distinct powers of the same person, than two distinct persons to be meant by those Names. This he took from the Greek Interpreters, who Interpret *Jehovah Elobim κύριον & θεόν*, the *Lord God*, and the same (b) Writer opposes the λόγος to God simply so called. St. Peter calls Christ the *Bishop of Souls*, 1. Ep. 2. 24. Thus in the most ancient Testaments of the Patriarchs we meet with *ἐπίσκοπος ὁ μονογενὴς*, the *Episcopat of the only begotten*. Benjam. c. 9. The meaning and design of which was, that no Man might presume to despise the Bishop, because if any one did so, he was to fear the vengeance of the Son as well as the Father himself, by reason that the name of Episcopat was common to both. The inspired Writers used

(a) Philo
l. 1. Alleg.
p. 58. l. 2.
p. 74. de
Plan. Noe.
p. 226. de
Abraham
p. 367. de
rer. div.
Hared. p.
484. de
Somniis, p.
589. de vit.
Mos. l. 3.
p. 669.
(b) Philo
l. 2. Alleg.
p. 93. de
Somniis p.
599.

used the same Argument before; for thus says our Lord, *He that hears you, hears me and he that despises you, despises me likewise; But he, that despises me, despises him that sent me.* St. Luke 10. 16. St. Mat. 10. 40. St. John 13. 20. Thus the affronts offer'd to the Bishop, redounded upon the Father and the Son, according to Ignatius: as those offer'd to the Apostles redounded upon the same, according to our Lord; and this very justly, since our Saviour spoke these words concerning the Discipline which was to be established in the Church forever. And therefore if this right is to be reckon'd among the hereditary rights of the Apostles, 'tis plain, that when their College was extinct, it was to descend together with the other rights of that College to their Heir, but especially to the ~~Person of the Son~~ who might very justly challenge to themselves all those indivisible rights, which belonged to none but particular persons, in the opinion of the new Legislator. For we are not to take these Allusions for mere flights of Fancy, but rather for Divine compacts, by which God himself takes upon him to perform on his side the things signified by these Allusions or Similes. We find the express words of the compact in St. Mat. 16. 19. *Whatsoever thou shalt bind on Earth, shall be bound in Heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on Earth, shall be loosed in Heaven.* This was said to St. Peter, but elsewhere we find it said to all the Apostles, St. Mat. 18. 18. St. John 20. 23. and consequently

quently to the Bishops, the Successors of the Apostles. To *Bind*, signifies the same as to *deliver over to Satan*, 1. Cor. 5. 5. 20. for Satan is said to *bind*, St. Luke 13. 16. which allusion is taken from those Magick Ligatures or Knots, by which Sorcerers, who acted by the help of evil *Demons*, used to perform their Enchantments. Now because the external Symbol of these Sorcerers was *binding*, therefore the invisible Energy of the Devil was called by the same Name, that it might seem to answer the external Symbol. Thence the word *καταδεδεσται* to be bound signifies the same as *καταμαρτυρεται* to be bewitched, with the *Attick* Rhetoricians. See *Harpecration* upon the Word, and *Valesius's* Notes upon him. Thus one may be said to be bound, when he is *deliver'd* over to *Satan*, which according to the Doctrine of the Apostolical Age, actually happened, when one was turned out of the Communion of the Church. For the Holy Scriptures acknowledge no medium between *Christ* and *Belial*; so that those whom *Christ* would not own for his were believed to belong to *Belial*. After the same manner therefore a Man is said to be bound in Heaven, when *Christ* the invisible Bishop excludes him from the protection of the *Ministring Spirits*, who are sent forth to minister for them, who shall be Heirs of Salvation, Heb. 1. 14. and when he opens the Gates of Hell, who has the *Keys of Death and Hell*, Revela. 1. 18. for then it will be in the power of these envious Spirits, to exercise the

the cruelty of their nature, upon those that are ejected out of the Flock. On the other hand our Lord opposes *loosing* to this *binding* that proceeds from Satan; and *ought not this Woman, being a daughter of Abraham, whom Satan has bound in these eighteen years, be loosed from this Bond on the Sabbath day?* For the Prince of the *Age to come* has, and was believed to have the Keys of both States in his custody, so that he had a full power over the *Age to come*, viz- over Heaven and Hell. Our Lord gave to St. Peter the Keys of Heaven, and in his person not to the Bishop of Rome alone, but to all Bishops wherever they were constituted, in the opinion of St. Cyprian. This is they *Key of David*, which whosoever has, *he openeth, and no Man shutteth, he shutteth and no Man openeth*, Revel. 3. 7. All this rightly agrees with the person of Christ, who is the invisible Bishop. Therefore when our Lord deliver'd these Keys to the Visible Bishop, he took upon him to shut the Gates of Heaven to those, whom the visible Bishop thrusts out of his Communion, and in like manner, to open Heaven to those, to whom the Bishop opens the Doors of his Communion. And indeed to *shut* Heaven and to *open* it, signifies exactly the same as to *bind* and *loose*; and therefore when our Saviour intrusted St. Peter with the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, he afterwards adds: *and whatsoever thou shalt bind on Earth, shall be bound in Heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on Earth*

shall be loosed in Heaven. St. Mat. 16. 19. and therefore must be understood in the same sense as the foregoing words, viz. that the faithful Communicants should be received into the protection of the good Spirits, and such as were excommunicated be deliver'd over to the Wicked ones. Thus likewise, we find the form of a Compact in these words: *Whosoever's sins ye remitt, are remitted to them, and whosoever's ye retain, are retained*, Exactly agreeing with that Expression of the Apostle, *To whom ye forgive any thing, I forgive also*. For as St. Paul deputed the *Corinthians* to act for him in his absence, and ratified the absolution of the *Incestuous Brother*, which the Church of *Corinth* had granted him in that Apostle's Name; the same conduct will our Saviour observe in relation to the Apostles, and ratify the Remission or Retention of Sinners, according as they pronounce Sentence. Thus he foretells, that his Name shall be in the *Angel* or *Hornet*, whom he appointed to conduct his chosen People to the Land of *Canaan*, and therefore advises them not to be retractor or stubborn, for that the Angel, who was invested with the Name of God, would not forgive them in case they trespass'd against their Duty. In like manner we are to understand, that the Name of *Bishop* being communicated now to the Governors of the Church, God himself will take certain vengeance on such as offer any indignity to them. Thus *Ignatius* tells his People, that they might deceive the visible Bishop, but could never hope

2 Cor 2. 10

to escape the invifible one; and *Ananias* and *Sapphira* found fatal experience, that it was the Holy Ghost whom they provok'd by the Cheat they intended to put upon the Apostles. *Moses* often affures the rebellious *Israelites* that they finn'd neither againſt himſelf nor *Aaron*, but againſt the Lord God, who wou'd chaſtiſe them ſeverely for their diſobedience. 'Twas a received opinion in all Ages and Countries of the World, that whoever injured or insulted holy Men muſt expect that God wou'd call him to a ſtrict account. Thus we often find the Kings of *Israel* reprov'd upon the account of that Holy People: and this I could confirm by many inſtances out of Pagan Hiſtory, did I profeſſedly undertake the handling of this Argument. But it moſt viſibly appear'd in the mutinies of the *Israelites* about the Priethood of *Aaron*: for thoſe who aſpired to that Dignity had not *Moses*, much leſs *Aaron*, but God himſelf for their Enemy. Neither was it an opinion only embrac'd by the *Jews* or *Chriſtians*, that the Priests take the Perſon and Name of God upon them, while they are dignified with that Sacred Function. I don't know whether the words of the Greek Interpreters concerning *Seth* don't allude to this. *Gen. 4. 26. He hoped to be called by the Name of God.* We own that he was not called by the Name of his God, however he had his Cognomination from God, at leaſt ſo as to be called the Servant, or the Priest of God, after the ſame manner as in *Gen. 14. 18. Melchizedec* is called the Priest

† Jcr. 14 the Old Testament urge their being † call-
 19. c. 25. ed by the Name of God, as an argument why
 29. Dan. he should hear them, and deliver them out of
 19. 9. that distress under which they languished: and
 on the other hand they insist that he should not
 shew his Mercies to their Oppressors, because
 * Isaiah they were not * called by his Name. Thus
 35 19. *Antoninus Heliogabalus* assumed the very
 Name of his God; and *Dioclesian*, when he
 was the Priest of *Jupiter* at *Antioch*, laid a-
 side the Emperor, and took upon him the Person
 of *Jupiter* himself, if we may believe *Malela*.
 At least their being admitted into this Priest-
 hood or Mystery made both their Names sa-
 cred; for which reason *Eunapius* durst not
 mention the Man's Name that first initiated
 him. On the other hand, the Names of such
 as were expell'd from the Sacred Rites, were
 prophane, and not so much as to be mention'd
 in Conversation. 'Tis plain that *Ignatius* con-
 form'd his stile to both these Customs. The
 Name of God conferr'd the right of the
 Divine Patronage both respects, either in the
 Calling, or else being Cognominated by him.
 After the same manner do's the Apostle *St. John*
argue, where he says, That *whosoever*
had a fellowship with him, had a Fellowship
likewise with the Father and the Son. He
 names here the same Persons of the *Trinity*,
 upon whom *Ignatius* bestow'd the name of *Bi-*
shops, and whom he likewise owned to be the
 Heads of the Mystical *Unity*; intimating here-
 by that unless we keep up a fellowship with
 the

the Apostles, we shall never be partakers of a fellowship with the Father or with the Son. He likewise enumerates the Benefits of this Fellowship, viz. the *Light, Life, and Truth*, which he promises to such as embrace his Fellowship; whereas the whole tenor of this Epistle denounces the quite contrary, as *Darkness, Death, and Error* to those that refuse the aforesaid Communion. Thus we see that the Church, which was contemporary with *Ignatius*, argued rightly, and according to the Principles of the Apostles. Nay, that 'twas morally impossible, she should be deceiv'd in these matters, we not only prove by the Arguments of *Tertullian*, but likewise by those Signs and Miracles, by which God was pleas'd to confirm the Discipline of that Age.

I confess indeed, that the word *Episcopat* was us'd in a larger signification, while the rights of the Church of *Jerusalem* continued entire, for it denoted the *Apostolat* of not only the Chief Apostle, but *Judas* the Betrayer. It was also attributed to Presbyters, not only of the Church of *Jerusalem*, but of foreign Churches, altho' we find that they were invested with no coercive Power at that time. But when applied to them, the word bore not a much different signification from what we have given it: for in both senses it implies the Office of God the Supreme *Ætioxo-* *πoς*, whose Stewards they only were. While our Lord was living, the Apostles and his other Ministers, that were employ'd in preaching the Gospel, were maintain'd at his com-

XXX.
The Apo-
stles and
Presbyter
of foreign
Churches,
tho' invest-
ed with no
coercive
Power, call-
ed Bishops,
because they
supervised
the Distri-
bution of
Alms that
were conse-
crated to
God.

Platarch
in Phoc.

Psalm 41. 9
St. Mark
4. 10. St.
Luke 22.
23.

men expence, which the charity of well-disposed Persons furnish'd. *Judas*, whom he had made an Apostle, was intrusted with keeping the Purse. The *Athenians* as well, as the Patriarchs of the younger *Jews*, had their *ἄνδοι*, who gather'd in their Revenues; and therefore we find *Judas* condemn'd for violating the rights of Hospitality and mutual Friendship; for which reason among other Qualifications requir'd in a faithful Steward, it was none of the least, *to get ready food for his Fellow servants at a seasonable time.* St. Paul reckon'd his Apostolical Function to consist in this Oeconomy, and 'tis manifest that our Lord took into his consideration the care of the foreign Poor. But when after his death numbers of Converts embraced the Gospel, as the Houshold became greater, so the Stewardship became more burdensome. The Temple of *Jerusalem* maintain'd Widows, Strangers, and in short all sorts of Poor, with the Tenth of every third year: and therefore that the New *Peculium* might not even in this respect fall short of the Old, the Apostles undertook this troublesome Province upon themselves, and supported this charge out of the Patrimonies of the Godly, which they sold and threw into one common Bank. Afterwards as the numbers of the Poor increased; and a murmuring arose of the *Hellenists* against the *Hebrews*, because their Widows were neglected in the daily Ministration, the Apostles thought it expedient to constitute Deacons for this purpose, that they might

might not be oblig'd to leave the Word of God, and serve Tables, *Acts* 6. 2. From this passage we learn by the by, that the Apostolical Office comprehended both these things, and was compatible with the Supervising of the necessities of the Poor. We read that the price of these Estates was laid down at the feet of the Apostles, who represented the Person of God in this affair. This gives us the true meaning of those words to *Ananias*: *Thou hast not lied unto Men, but unto God*: and to *Sapphira*; *How is it, that ye have agreed to tempt the Spirit of the Lord*, ver. 9. For God takes upon Himself the Patronage of the Poor, of Widows, of Strangers, and the like, who are destitute of human relief; and therefore this care, since it respected God Almighty, might in true propriety of Speech be called *Επιτροπή*. Now this charitable provision for the Poor was not confin'd solely to *Jerusalem*, but other Churches likewise took the same measures. The Apostle teaches us *1 Tim.* 5. 9, and 16. that Widows were registred in the publick Catalogues of the Churches, and maintain'd out of the Stipends belonging to the same; and *ibid.* 6. 18, 19. that the Stores of Wealthy Men were laid up for a common use. As for *Strangers*, not only such went under that Denomination, who leaving their Country Worship, embraced the Christian Faith, and forfeiting their Patrimo-
1 Cor. 9. 5.
 nies upon that score, knew not how to maintain themselves, but likewise all those that were despoil'd of their Estates for the com-
mon

mon cause of Religion, as *Martyrs*, and *Confessors*, and those that travell'd abroad to carry on the same common Cause, as *Apostles*, *Evangelists*, and the Itinerary Ministers of all sorts belonging to the Church of *Jerusalem*. And not these only, but their Wives also, to enable them to promote Christianity among those of their own Sex. The extended charity and hospitality of that Age, which was the chief part of Fellowship among all the Churches of the World, comprehended all these Persons, whom the Canonical Writers stile *The household of the Faith*; because they were maintain'd by the Lord's Table, by the spontaneous Oblations offer'd at the Altar, and by the publick stipends of the Church. For the Church of the living God is called the *House of God*, 1 Tim. 3. 15. and is likewise opposed to private Houses, ver. 5. So that God himself was the *Paterfamilias*, or chief Master of this House, whereof the Governors of Churches were only the Stewards: and indeed that publick Table, which was destined to publick uses, exactly answer'd the management of a Family. Of the same nature were the publick provisions of Meat and other Necessaries in the *Prytaneum* of the *Athenians*, and the *Syssitia* of the *Lacedemonians*. The Apostle mentions the Steward of a City, and several Monuments of the Ancients expressly inform us that there was a right of Hospitality observ'd between particular Cities. As therefore in the Church of *Jerusalem*, the distribution of these Alms belong'd

Gal. 5. 10.

long'd to the Apostles; so in the foreign Churches the *Presbyters* were intrusted with it, who are likewise call'd *Bishops*. This we gather from that very passage, which the *Presbyterians* have so strangely wrested to their own Meaning: Οἱ καλῶς Πρεσβύτες, &c. *Let the Elders that rule well be accounted worthy of double honour, especially they who labour in Word and Doctrine*, 1 Tim. 5. 17. The Apostle no where intimates that these Πρεσβύτες were Laics; but this he fairly suggests, that tho' it belong'd to all the *Presbyters* in general Πρεσβεῖν, to rule, yet it did not belong to them, *quatenus Presbyters*, to labour in the Word and Doctrine. These People did not know what was the true meaning of the word Πρεσβεῖν. But the abovemention'd Apostle we see joyns it with καλῶν ἔργων, where it signifies to maintain good works: namely in the same sense as *Dorcas* is said to be full of good works, and *Almes-deeds*, which she did: and the rich are commanded, that they do good, that they be rich in good works, ready to distribute, willing to communicate, 1 Tim. 6. 18. Thus St. Cyprian delivers himself in his Book *de Opere & Eleëmofynis*, where he has other things relating to this purpose: nor do's *Justin Martyr* talk otherwise, who makes the chief Office of the Πρεσβύτες to consist in providing for such as were in want. Now altho' he mentions onely one of this sort, yet the Holy Writers make them many, by reason of the above-mentioned change. The Office of a Πρεσβύτες among the *Athenians*, who supervised the

μειστοί,

μέτοικοι, or *Foreign Sojourners*, was not much different from it; for every Foreigner lay under the lash of the Law of Rebellion, unless he procur'd an *Athenian* to appear in his behalf, and plead his cause in the *Forum* at *Athens*. These μέτοικοι, or *Sojourners* were reckon'd among the *Strangers*; who, as we have already observed, belonged to the care of the Ecclesiastick Πρεσβυς, or *Governor*. Of the same nature too were the *Roman Patroni*, since they took not only the meaner sort of their own Citizens, but Foreigners also into their Patronage by publick Tables, some of which made of Brass are still extant. Thus in the case of foreign *Presbyters*, Πρεσβυς, and to labour in Word and Doctrine, exactly answer'd one another, as the Ministry of the Word and of the Tables did in the case of the *Apostles*; for the former enjoy'd the first place among the Clergy of the foreign Churches, as the *Apostles* did in that of *Jerusalem*. There were likewise some of these, who by reason of the similitude of their Office went under the Name of *Apostles*, being call'd *Apostles of the Churches*; that by this Denomination they might be distinguish'd from the *Apostles* belonging to the Church of *Jerusalem*. And these perhaps might be such as gather'd Alms in the suburban Villages. 'Tis certain however, that the very place where we find them mention'd, shews that they were imploy'd in relieving those Strangers, that travell'd upon the score of Religion. Now the Holy Scriptures teach us that the Distribution of Alms

belonged

2 Cor. 8.
 23.

belonged in common to them both, whether they are called Presbyters or Bishops. Thus St. Peter the Apostle advises his Fellow-Presbyters; *Feed the Flock of God which is among you, ἐπισκοπεῖτε, or taking the oversight thereof not by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready Mind. Neither as being Lords over God's heritage, but being examples to the Flock, 1 Pet. 5. 2, 3.* All these Expressions allude to the Money-affair. They are said to *feed the Flock of God*, which is the meaning of ἐπισκοπῆ in its proper signification, in the same sense we just now gave it, whereby this Episcopat is referr'd to God. 'Tis certain that ἐπισκοπεῖν μὴ ἀναγκάτως, or, as we render it, *to have the oversight not by constraint*, signifies the same, as in St. Paul to give grudgingly, or out of necessity; to which he opposes a cheerful Giver, 1 Cor. 9. 7. The word αἰχρὸνίδης alludes to the same alacrity in giving, by which it is intimated, that it wou'd be *filthy lucre* for a man to misapply the publick Alms of the Church to private uses. Nor are the following words to be interpreted otherwise, if they are rightly understood. By the name of κληρονομία, we are not to understand Men, but those Parrimonies, which when they were sold, were laid aside for the use of the Poor; therefore such a one may be said κατακυριεύειν, or *to Lord it*, who so manages this sacred Parrimony, as if it was his own, and he was the true Proprietor of it, in which sense κλεινός does not signify *Domination*, but *Propriety*.

For

For this is properly *κατασκευάειν*, when a Man converts those things to his own use, of which he is not the *Κύριος*, or *Proprietor*. Then the meaning of the word *τύπος*, or *Example*, is this, that it was a matter of good *example*, faithfully and uprightly to acquit one self of a Charge, accordingly to the Intention of him that intrusted us. Thus we find nothing in the whole Office of a *Presbyter*, such as 'tis here describ'd, that may not be referr'd to the Eleemosynary affair. Thus in the case of those Persons, whom St. Luke calls as well *Presbyters*, *Acts* 20. 17. as *Bishops* ver. 28, St. Paul proposes his own Fidelity and Care in managing the publick Money, as an *Example* for them to write after. Nay, he reminds them how he had supported himself by his own Handy-labour, that he might not be a burden to the Church. At last he draws this Inference: *I have shewed you all things, how that so labouring ye ought to support the weak, and to remember the words of the Lord Jesus, how he said, It is more blessed to give, than to receive, ver. 35.* Who do's not discover here at first sight, that the Apostle is discoursing of the Treasures of the Church, which were to be laid out in relieving the necessities of the infirm, and that the true design of his whole Harangue is to represent to his hears that they ought rather to give out of their own Stock, than receive from the Church even those things, that were due to them for the administration of their Office? And therefore the advice he gives

gives them *ver. 28.* about feeding the Flock, *over which the holy Ghost has made you ἑπισκοποι, or Overseers;* all tends to this Point. He hints to them that it was not his Flock, as we have already shewn, which was to be maintain'd out of the publick Treasures, that they were not his Treasures by which they were to be maintain'd; and moreover that it was not his *Episcopat*, that impos'd upon them the Office of *feeding* the Flock, but that it was enjoin'd them by the Holy Ghost. From all which he might justly draw this Conclusion, that they were as well to take heed of *themselves* as of the *Flock*: of the *Flock*, that they might not want any necessities as far as the Treasury of the Church cou'd relieve them; and of *themselves*, that they should not pervert the Money they were intrusted with to their own proper use: for that in such cases the indignation of the Holy Ghost, who avenged himself on such as violated their trust, was justly to be dreaded. The manner of arguing here is exactly the same with that which the Apostles used in the case of *Ananias* and *Sapphira*, to shew that they lied to God, and not to Men: intimating that they represented God's Person, whose wrath and whose punishment they ought to fear. For no less were the Priests themselves to expect the Divine vengeance for profaning the Priesthood, than those that affronted the Priests were to expect the like, upon the same account. Thus we see that *St. Paul* both in his Epistles to *Timothy* and *Titus*, requires in a *Bishop* those very individual

vidual Qualifications, which suppose the Function to be exactly such as we have above described it. He approves that common saying; *If any man desires the office of a Bishop, he desires a good work*, 1 Tim. 3. 1. because a *Messias*, or *Supervising of good works* went along with it, as we have already shewn. It follows: *A Bishop then must be, &c.* 'Tis evident now from this illative particle *then* that the Qualifications which follow, wou'd enable and fit the Bishop for performing those *good works*, of which he was the Overseer. That many of them at least look this way, is beyond all dispute: as for Instance, that he shou'd be *given to hospitality*, because being influenced by so noble and generous a principal, it wou'd the better dispose him to entertain the Strangers and Necessitous, and relieve them under their pressing extreamities: that he shou'd not be *greedy of filthy lucre*, nor *covetous*, nor *given to wine*, lest he shou'd make an ill use of the publick Money; that he shou'd not be a squanderer of his domestick fortune; lest he shou'd embezzle in like manner the sacred patrimony of the Church; that he should not be a *striker*, nor a *brawler*; that he shou'd *have his children in subjection with all gravity*, and enforce those that partaked of the publick Tables, to do their duty, rather out of reverence to his Person, than out of the dread and fear of punishment.

In
cia, C
pared
the C
15. (1
Orpha
and an
as also
the O
or Ste
chiefly
ing A
busine
were
If besi
and a
mitted
more,
public
plenty
were
ed to
The I
wife r
answe
Exra
of Mo
the L
Scribe
of the
with
World
ans,
Jews,
Law.

In short this is the reason why the *οικονομία*, or the ruling of his own House, is compared with the *ἐπιμελεία*, or, taking care of the Church, or House of God, 1 Tim. 3. 5, 15. (those that looked after Widows and Orphans, are call'd *Curators* in the *Pandects*, and are the same with the Greek *ἐπιμεληταί*) as also, why the same Apostle summing up the Office of a Bishop, calls him the *οικονόμος*, or *Steward of God*, Tit. 1. 7. for *Oeconomy* chiefly consists in looking after and managing Accounts. This therefore was the proper business of the *Presbyters*, while as yet they were invested with no coercive Authority. If besides this, any of them taught, exhorted and advised the People, or the Poor committed to their care; but what is much more, if they refuted growing Heresies in publick, this they did according to the plenty of spiritual Gifts, wherewith they were endowed, and not as they were obliged to it by the common Duty of *Presbyters*. The *Γραμματεῖς*, or *Scribes*, who were likewise reckon'd among the *Presbyters*, exactly answer'd them in the *Jewish Sanedrim*. Thus *Exra* is call'd, *A ready Scribe in the Law of Moses*, Exr. 7. 6. *A most learned Scribe of the Law of the God of Heaven*, Ver. 12. *A Scribe pondering the words of the Law, a teacher of the little Ones*, Isa. 33. 18. who is join'd with the *Wise*, and with the *Disputer of this World*, 1 Cor. 1. 20. for among the Christians, who borrow'd this Example from the Jews, all their Priests were not skill'd in the Law. Those who were well versed therein,

L

the

the Holy Scriptures call Νόμικοι, and νομο-
 διδάσκαλοι, *Teachers of the Law*, and some-
 times barely Διδάσκαλοι, or *Teachers*. Thus
 St. Cyprian makes mention of certain Pres-
 byters in the Church, that were *Teachers*.
 The same we may gather from the re-
 ward of a *Presbyter*, who besides his com-
 mon Duty of *ruling*, labour'd likewise in the
Word, and in Doctrine. Now such a one
 was *worthy of double Honour*, viz. to have two
 shares in the *Monthly Dividend*, or *Mensurna*
Divisiones, (to speak in the Language of St.
 Cyprian's Age) one upon the common Score
 of his *Ruling*, and the other of his *Preach-*
ing, for the most Excellent Dr. *Hammond* has
 prov'd, that the word *Honour* may be taken
 in a pecuniary Sense. Indeed the following
 words evince, that it can't well bear any
 other Interpretation. 1 Tim. 1. 18. *For the*
Scripture saith, thou shalt not muzzle the Ox
that treadeth out the Corn, and the Labourer is
worthy of his hire; where the Apostle ac-
 knowledges a Reward due upon the account
 of the Labour, and a Reward too consen-
 taneous to the Nature of the Labour. Thus
 the Ox that trod out the Corn upon the
 Floor, was to partake of that very Corn
 which was design'd for other uses; and
 from thence it follows, that he was to have
 his share of the sacred Money, since purely
 by his means, others became partakers of it.
 The next words are taken out of the Gospel
 of St. Luke: *The Labourer is worthy of his hire*;
 St. Luke 10. 7. And this saying of our Lord
 was cited, with a design to show that the
 Preachers

Preachers of the Divine Word might receive temporal Things from their Auditors, in lieu of their spiritual Ones. Thus we have exactly described the Office of a *Presbyter*, such as it was in the Apostolical Age, and shown that it might properly enough be call'd an *Episcopat*, both upon the account of the Money that was consecrated to God, and that those, who were maintain'd with this Money, were under his Patronage.

Now this *Episcopat* is different from that, XXXI. which after the time of the Apostles became peculiar to the *Presbyters of the first Seats*, as we have already shown, neither indeed are they both referr'd to the same Person of the Tri-unity. The former *Episcopat* wholly belong-^{The name of Bishop, as taken for the principle, perhaps never applied to any, but the Head of the Church; but after the Apostles justly ascribed to them.} ed to the Holy Ghost, and the Transgressions committed on both sides, as well in the Case of the Apostles, as the Presbyters are referr'd to none but him. For Consecrations of what kind soever, whether of Things or Persons properly belong'd to him, and consequently the Profanation of consecrated Things fell under his Cognisance; and this may be the reason why he has no proper name, but that of the Holy Ghost, which belongs in common to him, and the other Persons. 'Tis certain we find no mention, either that the Father or Son looked upon themselves as affronted in that pecuniary Case. On the other Hand, the Crime of breaking Unity is refer'd, not to the Bond of Unity, but to the *Head*, as being the principle of this Unity. Now the name of *Head* is ascribed both to the Father and Son, by St.

Paul: And *St. John* the Apostle, as well as *St. Paul* tell us, that the Violation of this Unity is to be punish'd by them. But no one mentions the Holy Ghost as interess'd in this matter. Now this was the latter *Episcopat*, which solely belonged to the *New London* *degs*, after the Church of *Jerusalem* had lost her Primacy, and which, whether it belonged to any particular College, either of *Presbyters* or *Apostles*, in the flourishing times of the Church of *Jerusalem*, does not yet appear. I own indeed, that those who communicated not with the Apostles, were believed to have no Fellowship with the Father, or the Son, according to what we find in *St. John* the Apostle, and that that Sentence which alienated a Man from the Head of Unity, manifestly tended to a Dissolution of the same, But the Head of the Apostolical College, included the very Apostolical College it self. Neither did the Apostle clearly enough signify, in what respect a different Communion from that of the Apostles was to be esteem'd a different one from that of God, and the Son; that is to say, whether in respect of the Head it self, or the whole Apostolical College in general. On the other hand he takes it for granted, that those to whom he writ his Epistle knew it so well, that there was no occasion to explain it more fully. Now if this Consequence was to be admitted for the sake of the Head, then in the Primacy of the Church of *Jerusalem*, the notion of a *Head* will properly and solely belong to the chief Apostle. And

And
likew
'twi
Dest
name
New
happ
ly be
Chur
of E
thos
to be
beca
obtai
of ti
was
wher
in th
Jeru
ticul
new
mag
Apo
the p
it inc
this
and
the
but
who
Cha
have
with
taug
it.

And if so, then the name of *Bishop* might likewise properly belong to him; so then, 'twill be no innovation at all, that after the Destruction of the Church of *Jerusalem*, the name of *Bishop* became peculiar to the *Πρωτοκαθεδρῆς* there. All that we can say happen'd new, is that, whereas at first it solely belonged to the *Πρωτοκαθεδρῆς* of the Church of *Jerusalem*, and afterwards to him of *Ephesus*, now it was communicated to those of other Churches. And if so, 'tis less to be wonder'd, that the name of *Bishop* became proper to the *Πρωτοκαθεδρῆς*, and obtain'd so Universally, in so short a compass of time. The legal Devolution of the name was of it self sufficient to make it every where received, if it had been proper before, in this sense at least, to the *Πρωτοκαθεδρῆς* of *Jerusalem* or *Ephesus*. But there was a particular reason at this juncture, why this new Dignity should be set out with the most magnificent Titles that might be. As the Apostolat was every where honour'd with the profoundest respect, the Apostles thought it inconsistent with Modesty to profess that this Office was conferr'd upon them by God, and for that reason rather stil'd themselves the *Servants of God*, than his *Apostles*. Not but that, if they had had to deal with those, who would not pay that deference to their Character, which was due to it, they would have set a just value upon that Office, where with God was pleas'd to honour them, and taught others to have the same esteem for it. And therefore we find, that they them-

selves never refused, when the publick good obliged them to observe this Conduct, both to have their Office, and themselves also upon the account of this Office, with which they were intrusted, be recommended to the World, as far as decency would permit them. 'Twas certainly necessary for the publick good, that this Function should be receiv'd with all possible respect, and that the Persons advanced to it, however undeserving, should be respected upon that very Score. We are not so to confound the reciprocal Duties of Life, as to call that Modesty, which acts directly opposite to the publick good, properly so call'd. Nay, to speak impartially, 'tis no offence against Modesty, for a Man to claim that respect, which is due to him upon the account of his Place. There is no reason why we should boast of a Place, with which we are intrusted, or assume that to ourselves, which only belongs to us upon the merit of the Place. Thus this new name of *Bishop* was a sort of a fence to the *New London* *Diocese*. It gave those that were subject to them to understand, that whatever Indignities they offer'd to them, were directly levell'd against God, and his Son, and therefore they could not flatter themselv to come off unpunish'd. On the other hand there was no reason why the *New London* *Diocese* should grow haughty, and insolent upon it, since they could not but expect to have a greater Portion of the divine Vengeance fall upon them, as we have proved above, if in any thing they acted

contrary

contrary to their sacred Character. Ignatius seems to have had both these Things in his Head, when he thus exprest himself concerning Polycarp: To Polycarp, Bishop of the Church of Smyrna, or rather bearing the Office of Bishop, Ἐπισκοπούμενος, under God the Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ: For it exactly agrees with his other reasonings, as we have already observed. So then, when these Πρωτοκλήσοι first of all took this new name upon them, it was but fitting that all the rights of the Office should rather be asserted, than the modesty of the Officer consulted, for now was an Example of Obedience to be set up, which was to continue as long as the World lasted.

By this means, therefore was the Unity of particular Churches so well provided for, that whosoever embraced a different Communion from that of the Bishop, he was upon that very account to be separated from God, and his Christ, since it was in the power of every Bishop to pronounce all Rebels aliens from both. So that the Bishops obliged God and Christ not to own such for theirs, whom in their name they had declared to have no fellowship with them. On the other hand too, it was in their power to admit those as Members into the Church, which is the Body of Christ, whom Christ would own for the Members of his Body, for this very reason, because, they were admitted in his Body by those whom he had intrusted with the care of it. Upon

XXXII.

The Connexion of the visible Bishops, with the invisible one, the reason why the sentences of particular Bishops either gave, or took away the right of Universal Communion.

both Cases the validity of the Sentence depended upon this, that whatever was done by the visible Bishop here on Earth, the invisible Bishop would ratifie the same in Heaven. Thus it was the interest of all Bishops, that the Sentences of each in particular should be confirm'd by Christ, the invisible Bishop, for if any one of them should call in question the Sentence of his Brother Collegue, by the same procedure, he gave his other Collegues room to question, whether his own Sentences would be confirm'd by the Celestial Judge: And therefore all of them were agreed in this, that the Sentence of the invisible Judge was the same, with what the visible one pronounc'd here in his respective district below. Now in this they were all equally concern'd, because if the Sentence of any one particular Bishop was ratified, then the Sentences pronounced by them all would be ratified alike; but, if the Sentence of any one was call'd in question, the Sentences of all the rest must of course be liable to the same Exceptions: And after that rate no one Sentence could have been pronounced, which would have obliged the whole Episcopal College. But if the case had not been so as I have stated it, the Bishops of particular Churches could neither have admitted any into the Catholick Communion, nor excluded them from it. Besides the Sentence of the Bishop, far from being terrible, would have been a very contemptible thing, if it had not conferr'd, or
 taken

taken away any right beyond the district of his Diocese, and if after it had been once pronounced, it had been still lawful for other Bishops, either to admit or refuse it in their respective Provinces, as they pleased. But now it is an undoubted truth, that in the next Age, after *Ignatius*, it was an universally received Maxim, that whosoever was received by one of the Episcopal College into his Communion, whether by Baptism, or by Imposition of Hands, in case he forfeited the right of Communion granted him by Baptism by any enormous Offence, the same Person by virtue of *Commendatory* Letters from his own Bishop, was received by all the other Bishops in the World. On the other hand, when *Marcion* was excommunicated by his own Father, who was a Bishop in *Pontus*, the Church of *Rome* durst not receive him into Communion, till such time as he had so far satisfied his Father as to revoke his Sentence. 'Tis not so in secular Societies, whose rights are merely Temporal, and may be given or taken away apart. 'Tis not necessary that a Man, who is made free of one City, should consequently enjoy the Privileges of another, or that he who is banish'd out of one Kingdom, should be made incapable of living any where else. This evidently shows what a vast difference there is between the several Rights of the Church and State. A Prince has no Right to pretend, that whatever Sentence he passes upon any of his own Subjects, should be confirm'd by all

all his Brother Princes ; and therefore 'tis not reasonable, that he should Usurp the Rights of the Church to himself, which God Almighty never granted to the secular Magistrate. Now the Foundation on which the Ecclesiastical Right depends is this, that the Bishops, as representing the Person of God and Christ, can consequently confer, and take away those Things, which God, and his Christ can confer, or take away ; and which no Earthly Prince whatever has a Right to bestow, or take away. Therefore since this power of the invisible Bishop, is communicated to the visible one, 'tis necessary that the Sentences of particular Bishops should be confirm'd by all the rest. For from hence it follows, that when any Man is admitted into the Church by the Bishop, at least in his own district, that he is in like manner admitted by Christ, and when he is ejected out of the Church, that he is likewise to be ejected by Christ ; but no one Member of the Episcopal College has a Right to refuse any one his Communion, whom Christ has admitted into his own, and acknowledged to be a Member of his Body, by his visible Vicar. Neither on the other hand, has any Bishop a Right to admit one into his Communion, whom Christ in the like manner has pronounced by his visible Vicar to have no fellowship with him. These reasons plainly demonstrate, that 'tis not only the interest of every particular Bishop to confirm the Sentences of his other Brethren

thren in their respective Districts, if he has a mind that his own should be confirm'd by them, but that they lye under an indispensable necessity to confirm them, since the Sentences of Christ are to be confirm'd by them all, and the Sentences of particular Bishops, at least in their own respective Districts, are to be accounted the same with the Sentences of God and Christ. And 'tis but Justice it should be so, since Christ, the invisible Bishop, delegates his Power to the visible Bishop, and invisibly obliges him as much, as if he were present upon the place. For by this means the Sentences past by them, are likewise supposed to be past by Christ, and reckon'd of equal Validity. And by this means likewise, the Bishop was only subject to God and Christ, nor to be judged by the College any more, than Christ himself. And this in short was the Opinion of St. Cyprian's Age.

Now the reason of this universal Obligation XXXIII.
 on ariseth from hence, that there was only ^{What Ignatius}
 one Church in the whole World, one Altar, ^{meant by}
 one Bishop, and one Episcopate, a portion ^{the Catho-}
 whereof was intirely possess'd by every Bishop ^{lick Church.}
 in particular, as St. Cyprian, *de Unit. Eccl.*,
 expresses himself; so that whatever was done
 by any one particular Bishop, was imputed
 to the whole Episcopal College, and upon
 that account was to be confirm'd by it, as if
 it had been Decreed by the unanimous Suffrages of all. This is call'd the *Catholick Church* by Ignatius, whose words are as follow
 in his Epistle to the *Smyrneans*: *Wherefoever*
 the

the Bishop appears, there let the Multitude be, after the same manner as where Christ is, there is the Catholick Church, c. 8. This is the first and most ancient mention of this word, tho' I don't in the least doubt, but that it comes from a much higher Original. Now, because the discussing of this point fully, is of the last importance in Theology, especially that Branch of it which relates to Antiquity, I hope I shall undertake a task not unacceptable to the Lovers thereof, if I endeavour to explain this Affair with a little more accuracy than hitherto it has been done; I mean by the Assistance of God, who sometimes vouchsafes to reveal those Things to the least, which had escaped the Penetration of the most learned. We have nothing to do here with the common Signification of the word *Catholick*, whereby is meant the consent of those Churches at least, that were founded by the Apostles. *Hegeſippus* had not as yet discover'd their consent, when *Ignatius* writ this; neither did any Heresies spring up in *Hadrian's* time, to give any one an opportunity of discovering this Consent. Nay, it could not mean the universal Consent of all Churches, which passes for the Touch-stone of truth in the Opinion of *Vincentius Lirinensis*. I will not now enquire farther into the merit of that Argument, at present 'tis sufficient for me to remark, that this Signification has nothing to do with *Ignatius's* meaning of the word *Catholick*, which does not require the consent of many Churches, but much less that of all in general. But least of all has the meaning

meaning of Cardinal Perron any thing to do here, who supposes it owing to the Catholicism of one particular Church, that the rest were call'd *Catholick*. This Hypothesis is diametrically opposite to the *Ignatian* parity of all Churches. And lastly, that Signification which the Latitudinarians have bestow'd upon it, who make it comprehend all manner of Communion, at least Schismatical, within the compass of the Catholic Church, wherein Salvation is to be had, as it is the most contrary that may be to the whole Discipline of the Primitive Church, so it was far from being own'd, or any thing like it in that Age. Our *Ignatius* then calls the invisible and original Church, by the name of the *Catholic* one, under Christ the original and invisible Bishop, in which sense 'tis opposite to the secondary and visible Bishop, and the People congregated under him; and this very properly according to the Language, and manner of reasoning of that Age. The Greeks call'd the Assemblies, or publick Conventions of Cities by the name of *Ἐκκλησίαι*, consequently the Assemblies of the Heavenly *Jerusalem*, are to be accounted original Churches; namely, under the direction and Presidentship of the *λόγος*, whom we have already proved to be the original Bishop. Nay, *Philo* himself, who was a Contemporary of the Apostles, acknowledges that there's a City invested with Metropolitcal Authority in the *λόγος*; so that we can't doubt, but that he means the same Heavenly *Jerusalem*, to which all must fly, that are guilty of any particular

piacular Crime. For in his Book *de Profugis*,
 he thus expresses himself: *This is therefore the
 ancientest, the strongest, and the best Metropolis,
 not only a City, but the Divine λόγος or Word,
 to whom 'twill be the surest way to fly, the soonest
 we can.* From hence we come to understand
 what is the meaning of that Expression *to be
 in Christ*, according to the Phraseology of
 the New Testament, viz. the very same
 with what *Philo* means to be in the λόγος,
 the very same as to be a Citizen of the Hea-
 venly *Jerusalem*, and to be a partaker of its
 Privileges. In like manner, the Author of
 the Epistle to the *Hebrews* owns both a City
 and Church above: his words, relating to this
 purpose, deserve our Observation: *Heb. c.*
12. v. 22, 23, 24. But ye are come into Mount
Sion, and unto the City of the living God, the
Heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable com-
pany of Angels. To the general Assembly and
Church of the first born, which are written in
Heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the
Spirits of just Men made perfect; and to Jesus
the Mediator of the New Covenant, and to the
Blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better Things
than that of Abel. In this place the Apostle
 seems to describe the *Profelytism* of the new
Peculium, as that word denotes a going over
 to the worship of the true God, and to God's
 own People, the *Israelites*. Now the Anci-
 ents most frequently worshipped upon Moun-
 tains, and therefore the Prophet describing
 the wonderful Success of God's Worship,
 tells us, *That the Mountain of the Lord shall be*
upon the Top of the Mountains, meaning *Sion* the
 Moun-

Moun
 withi
 fed to
 was
 race
 Prom
 And
 obtai
 the H
 God;
 Old
 from
 that
 expec
 the r
 in th
 Terre
 Citiz
 mitte
 first
 ther
 purp
 of A
 Law
 Afte
 Hea
 ever
 own
 Reg
 born
 the
 Port
 of
 Stir
 ted

Mountain of the true *Peculium*, which was within the City of *Jerusalem*, as 'twas opposed to Mount *Sinai*, where the Mosaical Law was given, Situate in *Arabia*, the Seat of the race of *Ishmael*, which had no right to the Promises made to *Abraham*, Gal. 4. 24, 25. And as for the City, whose freedom they had obtain'd by this new *Profelytism*, he means the Heavenly *Jerusalem*, the City of the living God; for by that name the Writers of the Old Testament use to distinguish the true God from Idols; and withal 'tis intimated that that *Life*, which the Heirs of the old *Peculium* expected only to be Temporary, and those of the new to be Everlasting, was to be found in the Heavenly *Jerusalem*, and not in the Terrestrial. After this he describes the *Fellow-Citizens*, into whose Society they were admitted by virtue of this new *Profelytism*: And first of all innumerable Companies of *Angels*, rather mentioned by *Daniel*, than *Enoch*; on purpose to oppose them to that lesser number of *Angels*, by whose Ministry the Mosaical Law was promulgated, Acts 7. 28. Heb. 2. 2. After these he mentions, the first-born written in Heaven, alluding to that Custom, whereby every one used to be written, or taxed into his own City, St. Luke 2. 3. that is to say, in their Registers, or Books of Record. By the first-born, he means the *Patriarchs*, not only upon the score of their Antiquity, and the double Portion they might claim in the Inheritance of the *Peculium*; but likewise for their Sanctity, because the first-born were consecrated to God. He adds, the *Spirits of just Men made*

- made perfect, by which I suppose he meant
- (a) Heb. the *Martyrs*, for the same (a) Author elsewhere makes mention of such, *as were made perfect by their Sufferings*; and under the name of the *Just*, the Martyrs are often to be understood in the (b) Canonical Writings of the New Testament; and the (c) *Spirits of the just*, are to be taken in the same sense. So then he meant the original Assembly and Church of the Angels, the Patriarchs and Martyrs, and unless I am mistaken, he had in his head the annual Feasts of the *Passover*, the *Pentecost*, and the *Tabernacles*, and those great Assemblies, or holy Meetings, that used to be celebrated upon those stated Festivals: Intimating that these original and celestial Festivals were always grateful and acceptable to God, (which the *Hellenists* always affirm'd of the Originals) but that the Festivals celebrated here upon Earth, were acceptable to him upon no other score, than as they were united with the Original; namely, by that mystical Union which passes between the Originals, and the Copies. Now this is the first notion of an ἐκκλησία, as 'tis taken for a *Conventus*, or an *Assembly*, and from hence proceeds the second, whereby it means *the People flocking together in these Assemblies*. This therefore is the very same Church, which *Ignatius* call'd *Catholic*, and which has the same Presidents, God Almighty, and his Son. The aforesaid Author of the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, calls God *the Judge of all*; alluding to those *Κεῖραι* or *Judges of Cities*, who, as we have already observ'd, were

(a) Heb.
2. 10.

(b) St.
Mat. 23.

95.
(c) The
Song of the
three Chil-
dren,

were
of all
that
Appe
which
have
salem-
to me
ties of
Celest
ther c
ties on
Fathe
be has
be als
15. 2
oppo
i. e. a
only
Marty
the N
Præse
does
Blood
place
Princ
had b
pitiat
Festiv
ters a
which
to the
thor o
our e
Blood

were *Priests*. This *Κεῖται πάντων*, or *Judge of all*, signified the chief Judge of a City, and that of a Metropolitcal City too, to which Appeals were brought from the other Cities, which in respect of the other Jewish Cities, we have prov'd to be true of the terrestrial *Jerusalem*. But by the word *City*, we are here to mean not the Metropolis of the Jewish Cities only, but of all others, for such was this Celestial City reckon'd. Neither is the Father call'd *Κεῖται πάντων*, in respect of Cities only, but of the *Son* likewise: For the Father gave Judgment to the Son, *Who when he has put all Enemies under his Feet, then shall he also himself be subject to the Father*, 1 Cor. 15. 28. for thus God the Father, as he is opposed to the Son, is call'd *ὁ ἐνί πάντων*, i. e. *all in all*, by the Hellenists. Now not only St. Paul, but St. John, and our holy Martyr Ignatius join the Son, the *Mediator of the New Testament*, with the Father in this Prefecture of the Celestial Church; and does not the mention of the *sprinkling of Blood* teach us, that the Mediator in this place is to be looked upon as the Head and Principle of the Mystical Unity? The Apostle had before his Eyes the sprinkling of the Propitiatory by the high Priest, upon the yearly Festival of Propitiation: And the holy Writers ascribe (a) *Προσγωγή*, i. e. *access*, (a) Rom. which exactly answers the word *προσέλευσις*,^{5. 2.} to the Son. Nay the abovemention'd Au-^{Ephes. 2.} thor of the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, attributes^{18. and 3.} our entrance into the *Holiest of Holies* to the Blood of our Lord, Heb. 10. 19, 20, 22. He

M

like-

likewise shows that the Blood of our Lord is in this respect to be prefer'd to that of *Abel*, because it did not cry for revenge upon those that shed it, (which the Blood of *Abel* did) but even procured admission for them into the heavenly Places, if they repented sincerely. But after all, why did *Ignatius* bestow the name of *Catholic* upon that which we call the Church Triumphant? I answer, agreeably enough to the Platonic Language of the Hellenists, which the Writers of the New Testament so often imitate, as we have shown. For the Platonists call'd the Celestial Originals, τὰ καθόλα, as *Aristotle* knew well enough when he refused his Master's Opinion, who asserted Universals separately existing from Singulars. No matter, whether this Disciple of *Plato* represented his Opinion fairly or not; this is evident, that *Plato* us'd to talk after that manner, and call'd the Originals of Things, Παρδείγματα Καθολικά. This therefore was the primary Signification of the *Catholic Church*.

XXXIV. In the secondary Signification of the word, particular Churches may be likewise call'd *Catholic*, for the *Platonists* derive the εἰσις, or existence of particular Things from the original heavenly Ideas. Thus for instance, they supposed that every Man in particular was call'd a Man from the ἀνθρώπου, for so they call'd the original Man, or the εἰσις. Therefore by the Church of the Apostles; but not such as have changed the Monarchical Government of the several Churches.

same

same parity particular Churches were call'd *Catholic*, from the Original heavenly Catholic Church, in respect of the fellowship they kept with it. For the Orthodox Churches were believed to differ from Heretical and Schismatic Communion in this particular, that the former grew up into one Body with the Celestial and Original Church, and consequently conferr'd a right towards obtaining the rewards of the Original Church, which cannot be hoped for in Conventicles, differing from the Orthodox Church. Now all the Argumentation of the New Testament proceeded thus, *à priori*, viz. that all the benefits of Communion were Spiritual, and that none but God could dispose of them. But why did we expect that God would give them? By virtue of the Covenant he enter'd into with the Patriarchs, and the Promises made to them, and their Seed. This is the reason why those heavenly Rewards are set forth by *Abraham's Bosom*, and sitting down to heavenly Banquets with *Abraham, Isaac* and *Jacob*; that their Posterity therefore had no Pretensions to hope for them, unless they could prove themselves descended from that Seed, to which the Promises made to the Patriarchs were due, by virtue of the Covenant enter'd into with them. If they could prove this, then they afterwards grew up into one Body with the Patriarchs, and consequently possess'd all Rights and Privileges in common with them. Under the word *all*, I include the heavenly Rights, since the Patriarchs themselves, by virtue of the same Covenant, and the same Promises, were now in actual

Possession of the celestial Rewards. Upon this account the *Jews* allow'd the *Cutbean Samaritans* no portion in these heavenly Rewards, because the latter belonged to the Patriarchs's Seed in no sense whatever. And by the same reason the Christians proved that the *Jews* were to be excluded out of the *Peculium*, because that Seed, which had a right to the Promises made to the Patriarchs, was not of the *Flesh*, but of *Faith*. From thence they concluded, that those who only boasted of the *Flesh*, and not of the *Faith*, were aliens to that Seed of the Patriarchs to which the Promises were made: neither were those to be accounted their Ancestors, who now enjoy'd the Promises made to them, so as they could make up one Body with them, and receive the like Rewards: For upon this Unity of the Body depended all that fellowship, which should make them in like manner followers, or partakers of the same hope. They moreover urged that *the Seed, in which all Nations were to be blessed*, was Christ himself, *Gal. 3. 16.* who was descended from the very *Flesh* of the Patriarchs in like manner as the rest. From hence it follow'd, that those, who did not own Christ, upon that very account did not belong to the Seed, to which the Promises were made; and consequently had no fellowship with those that had obtain'd the inheritance of the Promises in the heavenly *Jerusalem*. On the other hand, they asserted upon all these accounts the fellowship of the new *Peculium*, and the Seed of the Patriarchs by faith, with the Patriarchs then actually possessing

fessing their inherirance in Heaven. And in
 this manner are all the reasonings of the New
 Testament in this case to be understood, for
 it supposes that whatever the Members of one,
 and the same Body possess'd in Heaven, was
 like wise to be possess'd by the rest. The Apo-
 stle looks upon this Possession as an earnest of See Her-
mas's Past,
Lib. 1.
Vis. 3. N.
5. and Lib.
3. Sim. 9.
N. 4. 15,
16. that which was hereafter to belong to the
 whole Body, and takes those very Persons for
first-fruits, from whom the *Consecration* of the
 whole Harvest was supposed to proceed, 1 Cor.
 15. 20. Thus likewise he places a spiritual
 Building upon the Foundation of the *Apostles*
 and *Prophets*, *Jesus Christ* himself being the
chief Corner-Stone, Eph. 2. 20. By the *Prophets*
 he understands the Patriarchs, and shows that
 the old fellowship was with the Patriarchs, and
 the new one with the *Apostles* as the Foundati-
 ons of the Building; but in both places with
 Christ as the Corner-Stone, who join'd them
 both together, *in whom all the Building fitly*
framed together, would grow into a holy Temple
in the Lord. For to this superstructure built
 upon these Foundations, the Apostle ascribes
 it, that they were no more Strangers and Fo-
 reigners, but Fellow-Citizens with the Saints,
 and of the Household of God. From hence we
 gather that that Church has a fellowship with
 the Original one, which has a fellowship with
 the Apostles; after the same manner as those
 Persons had a fellowship with the Patriarchs,
 tho' they lived several Ages after them, that
 were descended from their Seed. Thus we see
 the Apostolical Original Church in Heaven,
 is that by which all the Churches upon Earth

are to be tried: and therefore the first Apostolical Church, in the same primary Signification of the word, may be truly and properly stiled *Catholic*, and even particular Churches at this time, if they will maintain the name of *Catholic*, and prove themselves to be built upon the Foundations of the Apostles; I mean, if they preserve the Doctrine of the Apostles pure and incorrupt. *Tertullian* in his Book *de Præscr*, c. 20. favours this Opinion. *Into so many, and so great Churches, is that one first Church founded by the Apostles branched, from which all the rest came: Thus all of them are first, and all of them Apostolical, while all of them approve one Unity.* And from this passage, unless I am mistaken, I can find out a better reason than that which I gave before, why the last Canonical Epistles are call'd *Catholic*; for upon this very account did they deserve that name, according to the reasonings of that Age, because they were *Apostolical*. For as the Church of the Apostles had therefore the name of *Catholic* given it, because it was the Original Church; so likewise the Writings of the Apostles were properly call'd *Catholic*, because they were the Writings of the original and heavenly Church. After the same manner, a very ancient Author, and one who, unless I am mistaken, lived in this Age, when the *Catholic* Epistles were so call'd, I mean the Author of the *Testaments of the Patriarchs*, lately published in Greek by the learned Mr. *Grabe*, calls the Canonical Writings of the Old Testament, *the Tables of the Heavens*, and *the Prophecie of Heaven*. A contemporary of his, unless

less p
Auth
and v
Testa
above
ry w
Jacob
or th
that t
are t
wher
the
that
thos
We
Law
ings
to th
selve
the
the
mea
Cath
nal
Cath
to b
pos
lic,
Ori
stor
it t
tru
gir
ma
fle

less perhaps he is the same Person with the Author of *the Prayer of Joseph*, cited by *Origen*, and who seems to be the same that writ the *Testaments* of the three first *Patriarchs*, (for the abovemention'd *Prayer of Joseph*, might very well be introduced into the *Testament of Jacob*) does likewise mention Πάντας ἑρραν, or *the Tables of the Heavens*. Certain it is, that the *Patriarchs* gather those Things that are to be found in those celestial Books, no where else, but out of the *Scriptures*, altho' the Author thought it an *Indecorum*, that they should quote the words of those that were younger than themselves: We read in *Deuteronomy* 33. 2. of the *fiery Law*, which pursuant to the *Mystical Reasonings* of the *Apostolical Age*, is to be refer'd to the *Original Law*. Nay, the *Rabbies* themselves own that the *Law* is *ancient* than the *World*, which can only be affirm'd of the *Original Law*. Therefore 'tis plain, their meaning is, that all Churches are to be call'd *Catholic*, as far as they agree with the *Original Church*, which strictly and properly is *Catholic*; and thus all humane Writings are to be examin'd and tried by those of the *Apostles*, and are no farther to be call'd *Catholic*, than they agree with them. For all *Originals* are, as it were, so many *Touchstones*, by which the *Copies* are to be tried, if they pretend to assume those *Titles*, that truly and properly belong only to the *Originals*. And this pursuant to the *Platonic* manner of arguing. In this sense, the *Epistle of Barnabas* may rightly be call'd *Catholic*,

lic, because he was one of the Apostles that constituted the *Catholic*, and Original Church, altho' he was not one of the twelve. But then, you'll say, St. *Paul's* Epistles ought for the same reason to be call'd *Catholic*, and so ought the Gospels, at least those that were written by Apostles: 'Tis true, if we consider the Signification of the word they ought, but the reason why they were not call'd so, I suppose to be this, because they were either published by the Apostles themselves, when alive, or else were stamped by their approbation. For the Apostles when alive might be said in some measure to constitute an Original Church, but not a heavenly one, to which properly belongs the name of *Catholic*. Now those Epistles we call *Catholic*, being collected into one Volume, began to be call'd so, when neither the Apostles were longer conversant upon Earth, nor the Writers of those Epistles, nor others that could confirm the veracity of them by their Testimony. This is the reason, why doubts arose concerning the greater part of those which were not published to the World, till a considerable time after the death of the Apostles. Upon this account *Eusebius* remarks, who of the Ancients first mentions these Epistles: Now as for the first Epistles of St. *Peter*, and St. *John*, he traces Witnesses that lived in the very next Age to the Apostles, tho' they were not Contemporaries with them, but however Witnesses proper enough to make the genuineness of them pass undisputed. The abovemention'd

Eusebius

Eusebius has observed, that the Witnesses of the other Epistles are of a younger date. So then we conclude, the name of *Catholic* to be challenged from a consent with the Apostles, at least in Doctrine. Nor is that all, but likewise 'tis necessary that they be Members of the same *Body*, if they would be Members of the same *City*. Those Persons therefore make up one Body with the Apostles, who preserve inviolate that sort of Government, which the Apostles left them by hereditary Succession, and not those that have destroy'd the Constitution, and from a Monarchy turn'd it into an Aristocracy. But we complain, that the fellowship with the Original Church is broke off upon another account ; for the Father, and the Son, as being the principles of mystical Unity, preside over the heavenly Church, and consequently none but those Churches keep up a fellowship with the Original, which in Conformity to that can show those principles of Unity, by which the Father and Son may be represented ; which visible principles of Unity, the Aristocratical Model has rejected, and therefore may be said to have rejected the Father, and the Son, as the principles of Unity. Such Churches consequently are aliens to the Father and Son, and also to that Original Church, which is united under them both. And upon this foot, 'tis certain they proceeded all along in their mystical Reasonings, after the manner of that Age. So then

then we find, that those Churches could not assume the name of *Catholic*, which had cast off all Fellowship with the Original Church, from whence particular Churches derived that name. 'Tis true, God Almighty, if he had been so pleased, could have kept up a fellowship or mystical Unity between the Original Church, and other visible Churches, in any manner of Government, whether Monarchical or not ; but all this intirely depends upon his own free Will and Pleasure. He may, and that with the greatest Justice, in benefits that we are only to expect from his free Will, oblige us strictly to observe those means, which in like manner depend upon his free Will. Thus he would not cure *Naaman* of his Leprosie, by any other Water than that of the River *Jordan*, so that the *Syrian* must have gone without a cure, if he would have tried none but his own Country Rivers. Now this Obligation, as well as Sanction, is most justly required in means, altho' they are wholly Arbitrary, and he that won't make use of the means prescribed him, has no pretence to expect the Benefits that are annexed to them. There is no Law without a Mult or Penalty to be inflicted on those that Transgress it, and this Penalty is inseparably join'd to the Sanction, least the disobedient should reap the same Privileges with such as obey the Letter of the Law. Besides, 'tis beneath the Divine Majesty to suffer the least Contempt and Indignity to be offer'd to it,

it, even in the slightest Matters: But such a one, especially, as presumes to violate a Divine Institution, for this is the necessary Effect of abrogating the principle of Unity. Nay, God is so far from conniving at these incroachments upon his Authority, that we always find him a most severe Executor of the most inconsiderable Ceremonies, in Things relating to his Worship. At least there is no colour or pretence, why God should ratifie their Inventions in Heaven, who have annulled his Constitutions upon Earth: And this single Consideration is sufficient to prove, that they have no Fellowship with the heavenly Catholic Church, and therefore are not to be accounted *Catholic*.

And now from this Fellowship of the Invisible and Visible Churches, we are able to account for a certain passage in *St. Cyprian*, where he Discourses about the Unity of the Church, and where he does not advance any Notions particular to himself, but what are exactly agreeable to the aforefaid *Hellenistical* Reasonings, which were then universally received. In the first place, there will be but one Church of all Christians, tho never so remote, and distant from one another, for the Church is a Congregation of People, who have a right to public Assemblies, and all other Privileges belonging to a City. And therefore in this sense there cannot be above one Church in a City. 'Tis true indeed, that

XXXV.

*St. Cyprian's words**are explained, concerning one Church, one Bishop, one**Episcopate,**a portion whereof was possess'd in**full by every Bishop.*

the freedom of one City may belong to many more, as we find the Roman Colonies were free of *Rome*, from whence they Originally came. Thus *St. Paul*, who was born at *Tarsus*, was upon that very account a Citizen of *Rome*. At last *Caracalla* thought fit to make all the Subjects of the Roman Empire, as far as it extended, free of the City of *Rome*, for which reason *Censorinus*, c. 16. calls *Rome*, the common Country of all Mankind: Upon which place it may not be amiss for the Reader to consult *Lindembrogius's* Notes. By this means it came to pass, that whoever was admitted into any one City belonging to the Roman Empire, he was (*ipso facto*) made a Citizen of *Rome*. After the same manner Affairs were order'd in the Christian Church. All Churches, tho' far distant from each other, admitted some, as they saw fitting, into the heavenly City of *Jerusalem*, and consequently into the Original Church of that City, and excluded others out of it. Had it not been so, the Communion of one Church had been confined within the limits of its own respective district, and could not have confer'd any right to the Communion of all other Churches, that were upon the same level with it. Neither indeed could the censure of one particular Church hinder any of its Members subject to it, who had been expelled its Communion, from being received by other Churches. But now when every particular Church had a right to ad-
mit

mit Persons into the *Original Church*, which is the same with the *Catholic*, thence came they to acquire a right of admitting them into all the other Churches of the World, because none of them could refuse him, whom the Original and Catholic Church in Heaven had already acknowledged; and surely not him, whom Christ, the invisible Bishop, had admitted by his visible Vicar upon Earth. On the other hand, since every particular Church had a right to expel out of the Original and Catholic Church, from thence it followed, that no other Churches, or visible Vicars of Christ could receive those whom Christ himself, by the visible Vicar of the place, to which they belonged, had already pronounced Aliens to himself, and his Catholic Church in Heaven. So then, since the Rights of all these Churches were one, and the same, and not at all differing from those of the Celestial Church, they could not but make up one Church among them, being incorporated as they were, upon one Head, to whom they ow'd, that themselves could be call'd Churches: For the Platonists, as they ascribed *Unity*, so likewise they attributed *Truth* to these Originals: And indeed St. *John* the Apostle reckons *Truth* among the Benefits of the Mystical and Original Communion. Therefore according to the opinion of the *Hellenists*, those which we call Churches here upon Earth, were no more to be accounted various Churches, than several

Parbelii

Parbelii of one, and the same Sun are to be call'd different Suns. By this Example the *Platonists* used to explain, how there might be various Copies, and resemblances of the same individual Original. 'Tis certain that all Churches so far borrow'd their ~~rights~~ from the Original Church, that those which are not united with it, have forfeited all their Rights, and consequently don't deserve the name of Churches, as the word signifies a Society, invested with spiritual Privileges. Therefore the very same reason, which makes all Churches that preserve a Fellowship with that above, but one Church, will likewise prove that all Bishops are but one Bishop in Effect, and that one only Episcopate is shared among them: For the invisible Bishop alone does all in all. He admitted into the Original Church, and he excluded out of it, he confer'd all the Benefits of the Mystical Communion, and he took them away. All that the visible Bishops had to do, was to supply the place every one in his own district, of the invisible Bishop, which was committed to his care, and in his name to pronounce such Sentences upon Earth, as should be afterwards confirmed by him in Heaven: And therefore, since they transacted all in Christ's Name, and not in their own, it follows of course, that all of them represented Christ's one Person: After the same manner, as if a Man should have Business in several Courts, and in each of these Courts should employ several Coun-
fellors

fellors to plead in his own Name, all these Counsellors, tho never so many, make up but one Person in the Eye of the Law, namely of the party who intrusted them to manage his Affairs, for he, and only he must come off a winner or a loser in all these Actions, the Verdicts affecting only himself, for the Counsellors get nothing for themselves, but for the Person that set them at work. We have already proved, that the name of *Bishop* belongs properly to God, and not to Man, and consequently cannot otherwise be applied to Man, than as that Man represents the Person of God. Therefore he is the only and true *Bishop*, in whose proper Name the Episcopat is discharged, and not he, who only executes another's Office committed to his care. Upon this account, 'tis impossible that there should be above one Episcopat in the World, since there is only one, who can truly and properly be call'd a *Bishop*. But perhaps it will look more like a Paradox, what St. (a) *Cyprian* (a) St. has advanced concerning this one Episco- Cyp. de
pat, viz. *That part of it is possess'd in full by* Unit. Ec-
every particular Bishop, and yet as contradi- cles.
ctory as it looks, 'tis infallibly true. This one Episcopat is wholly possess'd by every Bishop, for every particular Bishop can do as much, as all the Bishops in the World with their united Suffrages; he can admit a Man into the Communion of all the rest, and turn him out of the same, and the united Suffrages of them all, can do no more than
this.

this. And yet every particular Bishop presides only over a part of the universal Flock, and gives and takes away all the Benefits of Mystical Communion, not from all, but only from his own part of the universal Flock, in his own respective District. Thus there's no Contradiction in this passage, tho' it looks so gross at first sight.

XXXVI. The chief Privilege therefore, which accrued to every *Πρωτοκλήτης* in particular after the Destruction of the Church of Jerusalem, was this, that he was now in the same station which only belonged to the Bishop of Jerusalem before, viz. that every Bishop in his own respective District, was the principle of Unity; now from hence it followed, that the whole Right either of admitting to, or refusing Communion was lodged in the hands of the *Πρωτοκλήτης*, and that upon the account of his new Episcopal Character. 'Tis manifest from the constant and universal Practice of those Times, that the People who lived at the Juncture, when this new Right devolved upon them, believed so: For as none but Bishops gave *Communicatory* Letters, so they accepted them from none but those of the same Dignity, provided the Episcopal Sees were full; and were there nothing else to prove it, this alone were proof sufficient, that the whole power of giving or denying Communion belonged intirely to the Bishops. This is the reason why none, but they had a place in Councils, at least from that

How it
came about
that the
Bishops
made up a
peculiar
College a-
mong them-
selves.

that
Destr
must
has b
in D
Decre
ons,
but B
Bishop
in the
termi
ge.
byters
had a
munic
offer'd
not th
have
of Co
Presby
Bishop
may b
stingu
on no
some
Bishop
tentio
Consul
as they
same
made
selves,
posse
selves.

that Epoch we have laid down, viz. The Destruction of the Church of *Jerusalem*. I must own that the Advice of the *Presbyters* has been sometimes listen'd to, and especially in Diocesan Councils, but we never read of Decretory Sentences, of Final Determinations, and Sanctions of Canons made by any but Bishops. From hence it appears that the Bishops were invested with so eminent a Power in their own Dioceses, that they could determine them of their concurring Suffrage. We find that *St. Cyprian*, when his *Presbyters* without consulting him in the matter, had admitted some that had lapsed to Communion, looked upon it as an Indignity offer'd to his own Episcopal Function, and not the *Presbyters*; which he would never have done if he had only possess'd the right of Communion in consort with the whole *Presbytery*. For this reason he calls all the Bishops his *Collegues*, but not the *Presbyters*; nay by that very name of *Collegues* he distinguishes them from the *Presbyters*: Upon no other occasion to be sure, but that some Rights belonged in common to all Bishops, to which the *Presbyters* had no Pretensions. Thus the *Romans* used to call the *Consuls*, *Prætors* and *Tribunes*, *Collegues*, because as they had the same Name, so they had the same Power. And therefore that the Bishops made up a peculiar College among themselves, 'tis wholly owing to this, that they possess'd certain Rights peculiar to themselves. Upon this Score *St. Cyprian* acknow-

N

ledges

In Concil.
Carthag.

ledges no Bishop of Bishops, but roundly asserts, that every Bishop *was to give an account of his Actions only to God and his Christ, and that as he himself ought not to censure the Actions of another Bishop, so another Bishop ought not to censure his.* He maintains that all Bishops are made by God and his Christ, and not by the Presbytery, whatever that Fabulous Tri-
fler *Eutychius* affirms to the contrary, and that whoever presumes to disobey their Orders, must expect to be severely punish'd by God. He never talks thus of *Presbyters*, or of the whole Presbytery in general. This shews the Monarchy of the Bishops to have been most Absolute, at least according to the receiv'd Doctrine of that Age wherein *St. Cyprian* lived, nay even that when *Ignatius* flourished; for we find both those Ages agree in this. For this reason the *Roman Presbyters* confess that their own Power is clipt in a *Sede vacante*, when they have no Bishop empower'd to transact Affairs for them. For this reason too *St. Cyprian* in his Retirement enjoins his Presbyters so many particular things, which had not in the least been necessary, if the Rights of the Presbyters in that Age had been own'd to be so great, as the *Presbyterians* pretend. Neither was this all, but he joins to them those Bishops that lived nearest to his Flock, if any thing were to be done with greater Authority and Solemnity. Now I would willingly be informed why he did this, if he did not look upon the Authority of a Bishop

Bish
Dio
in r
Fath
his
eject
we c
mun
shop
not
cator
Nay
and
the
those
macy
Foot
byter
be H
boun
cates
byte
men
singl
with
thing
the
Bisho
veng
Presb
of J
ther
na^obeo
Statio
erciv

Bishop to be greater, even without his own Diocese, than that of the whole Presbytery in their proper place? The abovemention'd Father uses the same Conduct in the case of his own Schismatics, when they were to be ejected from Communion; for in this Age we don't find one approved Instance of Communion given or refused, without the Bishops consent, by the *Presbyters*, who had not so much as the Power to send *Communicatory Letters* to the Neighbouring Bishops: Nay, their Censures would have been Null and Void if they had not been confirm'd by the Neighbouring Bishops. 'Tis a plain case that those Writers who flourished when the Primacy of the Church of *Jerusalem* was on Foot, spoke after another rate of the Presbyteries. *St. Paul* commands the *ἡγούμενοι* to be *Honoured*, and *St. Clemens*, the Fellow-labourer of that Apostle, frequently inculcates the Reverence that is due to the Presbyters. But neither of them makes the least mention of the *Πρωτοκαθεδρικοί*, or any one single Presbyter. Now 'tis quite otherwise with *St. Cyprian*. He never talks of any such thing as Rebels to the *Presbyters*, nay not to the Presbytery in general, but only to the Bishop then being. He makes Christ the Avenger of the Episcopat, and not of the Presbyters; as if the Rights of the Church of *Jerusalem* had not devolved upon the other Presbyters, but only upon the *Πρωτοκαθεδρικοί*, and the rest continued in their old Station, that is to say, invested with no Coercive Power. I might add several things

relating to this purpose, were there any necessity for it, but the most Ingenious Author of an *English* Treatise, Intituled, *A Discourse concerning the Principles of St. Cyprian's Age*, has saved me that trouble.

XXXVII.
*And justly
according to
the Reason-
ings of that
Age.*

So then 'tis evident that matters went thus, at least *de facto*, and that they ought to be *so de jure*, is plain from the Reasonings and Arguments of those times, which we have proved to be Solid and Satisfactory; for certainly the Principle of Unity, which can only belong to one single Person, could never belong to the Bishop in Partnership with the Presbytery. Now if that properly was annexed to the Episcopat, the right of Communion likewise solely belonged to that. I call that the *Principle of Unity*, without which 'tis impossible for Unity to be maintain'd, when once lost, whatever other things we may suppose it actually possess'd of. But the abovemention'd Reasonings have fully shown that this belongs to the Bishop. For the mystic and visible Symbols are so inseparably join'd together, that whoever is destitute of the Symbol, cannot partake of the thing signified by the Symbol. Now Christ, who is likewise the invisible Bishop, is the Principle of mystic Unity, and consequently we can have no other Symbol of him than the visible Bishop. Thus he who is united to the Bishop is in like manner united to Christ, and he that follows any other Communion than that of the Bishop, upon that very account, is excluded the Communion of Christ, altho' he should Communicate with the whole Presbytery.

bytery. But he that does not Communicate with Christ, cannot be a Member of his Body, neither can he partake of the Holy Ghost, the Bond of that mystic Unity, neither of any mystic Benefits flowing from the same. And therefore * *Ignatius* was undoubtedly in the right when he maintain'd, that *the Church* * Ignat. ad Trall. c. 3. *could not subsist without a Bishop*; and St. *Cyprian* properly defin'd the Church *a Flock united to the Bishop*. Hence it necessarily follows, that none but the Bishop can admit any one into the Bishops Communion, or exclude from the same. As certain it is likewise, that none but he can admit any one to the Benefits of the Mystic Communion, or deprive him of them. Thus all the Rewards and Punishments belonging to the Christian Society are intirely lodged in the Hands of the Bishop. From thence it follows of course that the whole Administration and Legislative Authority of the visible Church, as far as it extends to this Society, belongs solely to him, and that without any Competitor. For he only can establish a Law that can confer the Rewards of the Society upon such as deserve them, and on the other hand deprive the Disobedient of all those Rights that belong to the Society. But 'tis impossible that any one can be a Competitor of the Bishop, who cannot claim the Rights of the Society to himself, in case he dissents from the Bishop, which even the whole Presbytery cannot pretend to do for the aforesaid Reasons; and therefore it does not in the least clash with Reasonings of the Apostolical Age, that the

N 3

very

very next Century to it believed that the Bishops made up a peculiar College among themselves; neither did they recede from it, in making God and his Christ the Authors of Bishops, but not of Presbyters, because the former, and not the latter, represented the Person of both as the Principle of Unity; while the Constitution of the Presbyters was fitly enough refer'd to the visible Principle of Mystic Unity. From thence it naturally follow'd, that God the Avenger of the Episcopal Dignity, but not of the Presbytery, was to be fear'd in case of Contumacy: For as God was the Principle of Unity, and the Supreme Bishop, he would concern himself in all Affronts offer'd to him, whom he entrusted to supply his place upon Earth, and who represented the Person of God upon the account of his being the sole visible Bishop. It properly belonged to God to protect and maintain the Supreme Power, which had none but himself to appeal to, and not a Subordinate Power which was placed under the Patronage of another. Thus we find every thing exactly agrees with the above-mention'd Reasonings, which we have al-

XXXVIII ready proved to have been used in the Apostolical Age.

*The afore-
said Form
of Church
Govern-
ment was
most useful
for uniting
Churches
with one
another.*

And indeed if we calmly and diligently consider it, there is nothing in this Constitution of Ecclesiastical Government to be found fault with. On the other hand we have all imaginable reason to admire the Divine Prudence of it, so well adapted in every point, for the better ordering of that Society.

The

The Christians at that time were one Society made up of many, that were obliged to maintain a firm Concord among themselves, since they could not expect any support from the Secular Arm. The Bond of their Unity consisted in this, that they hoped for greater Rewards from God, and dreaded greater Punishments from him than from the Civil Magistrate. This made them upon all occasions adhere closer to God than the Civil Magistrate, and tho' the latter used all his efforts to oppose their growth, yet their Unity still continued firm and unshaken. Besides, the two *Peculium's*, viz. the old and the new one were then to be united together, which was found a very difficult matter to bring about in those first times of the Apostles. Now there was no other way to effect it but that the Christians should Worship the very same God the Father whom the Jews Adored, and that the Jews in Conjunction with the Christians should be obliged to embrace the Worship of the Son. For by this means both Parties must necessarily agree in the same objects of Worship. The Christians from hence enforced the necessity of Worshipping the Son, because in our access to God the Introduction of the Son was necessary, and so made a Fellowship with him necessary: Now the Father as well as the Son might be Worshipped in different places; but what hinder'd the Uncircumcised Christians from frequenting the same place, and the same Assemblies with the Jews, was the inveterate Opinion of the latter concerning the Impurity of the

Gentiles, until they were become *Profelytes of Righteousness*. Thus St. *John* the Apostle infers the Benefit of those Assemblies, where none could be admitted that Worship'd the Father without the Son, or indeed both together, unless for the sake of Divine Worship they frequented the same places with the Uncircumcised. By this means the Partition Wall which heretofore divided the Jews and Gentiles, was quite to be taken down. However the Jews had the Precedence, while the Church of *Jerusalem* flourished, which was the common Principle of Unity both to Jews and Gentiles, and over which a Jew Presided. This was the *Grafting* mention'd by the Holy Apostle. Afterwards it frequently so fell out, that in many Churches one that was Uncircumcised was the Principle of Unity, and yet the Jews under pain of Damnation were obliged to own him for the visible Principle of Unity, if they would own the Father, of whom they boasted so much : For the Father was the invisible Bishop, and the Uncircumcised Bishop the Vicar of the Father, so that whoever refused the Communion of this Bishop, made himself consequently an Alien to the Father. Thus these Arguments firmly united the Jews and Gentiles together, since the Jews willingly submitted to an uncircumcised Principle of Unity, and on the other hand the Gentiles to a Jew, in case it so happen'd. Besides the Duty of Subjects was hereby made manifest, and every one knew what Parry he must adhere to, if so be any Discord should befall the

the Body. 'Twas impossible that the Bishop should disagree with himself: now the Communion with the Father and the Son, and all the Mystic Benefits arising from thence were in no danger of being forfeited, while Communion with the Bishop was inviolably preserv'd. In short they could expect no Salvation if they embraced any other Communion than that of the Bishop. Now I desire to know what more efficacious means could possibly be found out to preserve the Unity of the Body Politic, from which none could go astray, but by their own fault. If they suffer'd themselves to be guided by reason, no external Violence, how great soever, could separate and disunite them from the Bishop.

Thus the Security and Interest of particular Churches was effectually provided for, XXXIX. that they might not be dissipated by Persecution. Nay the public Welfare of all Churches *As also for* in general was consulted in that form of Government, which we have been describing. *Establishing the* While Churches were to be gather'd and *Concord of* planted the Primacy of the Church of *Jerusalem* was of mighty advantage; for that slow and gradual alteration chiefly contributed to the easier Conversion of the Jews. 'Tis certain that God and Christ were inclined to grant the Priority to the old *Peculium*, which they had never lost, had it not been for their own inexcusable Stupidity. The Divine Goodness would not that any *Jews* of the old *Peculium* should forfeit or unqualifie themselves for the Privileges of the new *Peculium*; and that as few as was possible might *different Churches with one another.* forfeit

forfeit them, he allow'd them time enough to lay aside their former Prejudices. Neither was he willing that the whole *Jewish* Nation should at once fall from all these Rights, to which the admission of the Gentiles became more acceptable, since themselves were united under the Jewish Head of the whole *Peculium* with the Gentiles. And indeed the farther this Authority of the Apostolical College and of the Bishop of *Jerusalem* was extended, (while 'twas evident that it was Infallible) so much the more serviceable was it to the public Interest of all Churches. *Hegeſippus* informs us that Heresies durst not appear in public, while upon their being Condemn'd by the Sentence of one Church, they had no hopes of being receiv'd afterwards by any Church whatever. It was much safer for them then to bolt out of their lurking holes, when one Church was not concluded by the Sentence of another, when there were so many different Opinions in the several Independent Churches, and the Authority of those that agreed was become of less Validity, by reason of the scandalous Dissentions of such as disagree'd from each other. Indeed, as for the Propagation of the Faith, the Authority of one single Church, which govern'd all the rest, tho' never so remote, was more likely to contribute towards it, since all would use their joint endeavours to promote the spreading of the Gospel; but then it must be own'd that it was not so advantageous for bearing the Storms of Persecution. This the Church of *Jerusalem* found by woful experience, for
when

when that was dissipated, the whole Christian Discipline and Government had irretrievably been lost, unless the abovemention'd Devolution of Rights had so brought matters about, that when one Head was cut off many new ones immediately had sprung up in its room. But by this means it came to pass, that 'twas impossible for Christianity to be wholly suppress'd, while one Church continued to observe Discipline, at least in its own District. And therefore he that would ruin all Churches must ruin every Church, because particular Persecutions are only prejudicial to particular Churches. But in this Parity of particular Churches the greatest difficulty lies, how 'tis possible to make them all unanimous in confirming the Sentences of each other. Now unless this be observed, the Discipline of every Church is either in danger of being lost, or at least must be wholly useless. But we lye under no necessity to prove the truth of this, which the Primitive Times, of which we are now Discoursing, show to have been unquestionable true as to matter of Fact. For then certainly if ever Discipline and Concord flourished in the highest Perfection. Therefore let the same Opinions return, which we have proved to be most agreeable to Truth, let them be as firmly and universally received, and we have no occasion to doubt but that what seem'd Consentaneous to Reason formerly will find the same Encouragement still. Let a hearty concern for Religion, Piety and Discipline return. Let that Primitive Ardour and Zeal in denying ones self, that Faith so ready

ready to undergo the severest Tryals, and that Patience, which so heroically contemn'd the World, but once return; and we shall soon find those happy times so fruitful in all the blessed Effects of Discipline and Concord will return again. There are Laws of Nations extant in no public Archives, and intrusted to the care of no Magistrates, in order to punish such as shall transgress them; and yet what by the perspicuity of right reason, upon which they are founded, what by their being so serviceable to the common Welfare of Mankind, and lastly what by the care of Divine Providence, which is continually watchful for our good, and is dreaded without the Intervention of the Magistrate to back it, we find very few, even in these degenerate dreggy times, so flagrantly daring as to violate them. To conclude, 'tis the common Interest of all Bishops to Confirm and Ratify the Sentences of their *Collegues*, if they have a mind that their own should in like manner be Ratified. We have shown how rightful and equitable it is, that this Conduct towards one another should be Universally observed, and as for the Parity of the Bishops, it will be far from being any Obstruction towards the flourishing of Discipline, either in matters of Faith or of Manners. Nay, in all probability it would extinguish all those unhappy Contentions which too often arise from Secular Pride, from Emulation, and from Envy.

Thus

Thus the Apostles left the Bishops equal to one another, as to the Power they exercised over their respective Churches; for if the whole Authority of the Church of *Jerusalem* had devolved upon any one particular Church, as the Flatterers of the Papal Monarchy maintain, the name of Bishop had become so peculiar to the *Hierarchs* of that Church, that the Presidents of other Churches could not have assumed the Episcopal Title, neither had they been Vicars of the invisible Bishop, as he was the Principle of Unity. Thus no Power had been lodged in other Churches, as before, but it had still belonged to the Itinerary Ministers of this one Church; all which we know to be notoriously false as to matter of Practice. It therefore follows that whatever Imparity among them afterwards obtained, is to be ascribed to the mutual Compacts of Bishops among themselves, and is no father valid than those Compacts could make it. 'Tis a difficult matter to determine how long this Parity continued, after the loss of so many Primitive Monuments, but I suppose it lasted almost till the times of *Constantine*: For then we begin to discover Canons of Councils about regulating the private Affairs of Dioceses. Indeed I cannot perswade my self that the *Apostolical Canons*, as they are call'd, are ancients than those Constitutions, whereof they are only a small part, whatever the Learned *Beveridge* may affirm to the contrary. Nay from the Punishments of the Bishops, and the Laws of private Dioceses, I conclude them not to be so much as Primitive.

XL.

The Imparity of Bishops, that happen'd afterwards to be ascribed to the Compacts of the Bishops among themselves.

tive. I am of opinion therefore, that those Canons to which the Fathers of the Councils of *Nice* and *Antioch* refer, were not written but generally received, like the *Laws* of *Nations*, or our *Customs* here in *England*. Before this, every Bishop of a Diocese compiled and abrogated Canons for his own respective Diocese, which had nothing of force in other Provinces, neither did he receive Laws from other Diocefans. Thus in the *African* Church some Bishops received penitent Adulterers into their Communion, and others excluded them from all hopes of Communion for ever, with a *Salvo* in the mean time to Communion, as likewise to the Commerce of Canonical Letters: For without the Letters of their own Bishop, who had excluded them, his Collegues would not receive these excluded Adulterers; and on the other hand they never refused them, if they brought Communicatory Letters from their own Bishop. Nay, that famous Synod of all the Provinces of *Proconsular Africk*, held under *St. Cyprian*, would not impose their Opinion upon one dissenting Bishop, if any such in his Diocese would rather allow of the Baptism of Hereticks. In the mean time *St. Cyprian*, the President of this Synod, promises it shall be so, with a *Salvo* to Communion. Therefore if any one Bishop of the College was resolved to support one that had been Baptized by a Heretic, his other Collegues were ready to receive him, whom otherwise they would not have admitted as a Subject of their Diocese without new Baptism. We
see

see here that this Synod rather met to consult the public Advantage, than to challenge to it self a power of imposing any thing by a Majority of Voices. In effect it was such a Power and no other, than what we find in those Conventions, where the Ambassadors of Independant Crown'd Heads meet together to advise about Matters of Importance. The Ambassador of one Prince, that refuses his Assent, is not at all obliged by the Votes of the Major part of the Ambassadors to the contrary. *St. Cyprian* there owns, that every Bishop is Supreme in his own Diocese, and only accountable to Christ. Therefore he says it is not Just, nay, he calls it downright Tyranny to compel any one of their Collegues to espouse their Opinion by the Majority of Voices. The reason he gives for it is, that none of the Episcopal College should pretend to set himself up for a *Bishop of Bishops*. He uses the same Argument which *Tertullian* had employ'd before him, when he ironically jeer'd the Bishop of *Rome*, who was imposing upon his Collegues, by calling him *Pontifex Maximus*. Both of them looked upon it as a gross Absurdity for any Man should pretend that he was Superiour to the Bishop, and that very deservedly, if we consider the aforesaid Reasons. For we have proved that the name of Bishop belonged properly to God, as being the Invisible Bishop, and who alone in propriety of Language deserved that Name. He was certainly that Bishop, by whom *Ignatius* says that *Polycarp* was supervised. Thus to be a Bishop
of

of a Bishop signified the same as to be God, and to judge of a Bishop or his Actions was in effect the same as if one should pretend to judge of God and his Christ. For after this manner does *St. Cyprian* argue in other places: And indeed I am of the opinion, that the Footsteps of this Parity continued longest in the *African Church*. For in the *African Code* of the Fourth Age the Canons of that Church provide, that no Bishop should arrogate any thing to himself, which favoured of Secular Pride; and therefore they derived the Priority in all other Provinces, except the *Proconsular Afric*, not from the Dignity of the City, but the Seniority of Consecration. So that upon this Foot that was to be reckon'd the first City in the Church, which had the ancientest Bishop; which certainly among equals was the fairest Regulation that could be thought of; for by this means every City, nay the meanest, was in hopes of enjoying this Primacy, without any ambition or undue struggling for it, if their Bishop lived long enough to confer this Honour upon them. Upon this account they forbade that a Metropolitan should be saluted by any other Name by his Brother Collegues, than that of *Bishop of the first See*. We read here of no Patriarchs or Arch-bishops, or any other Names of the like nature denoting Government, but those modest Appellations of *Primates, Elders and Old Men*, which rather denote Precedence of Place and Order, than import any Power over their Collegues.

And

And 'tis probable, that the same Moderation was not only observed in *Afric*, but in other Provinces; 'tis certain it was in *Italy* and even in the principal City, from whence I suppose some Colonies of Christianity were planted in *Afric* not long before *Tertullian*. He himself, unless I am mistaken, seems to intimate some such matter, and this perhaps was the reason why even the Bishops of *Rome* hardly received any other Titles from the *Africans*, but those of *Primates* and *Old Men*: in honour, as may be supposed, of their being first Converted by them. 'Tis certain, they must have been converted by *Latins*, because they spoke no other Language. Now all the Christians of the first Age writ in *Greek*, even *Clemens* and *Hermas* that were *Romans* did so, and therefore the *Africans* learnt this modesty from the *Romans* of the second Century. 'Tis an Observation of *St Irenaeus*, that the Predecessors of *Victor*, from *Xystus* down to *Soter* were less assuming than him; for altho' their Sentiments concerning the Celebration of *Easter* were the same with his, yet they never thought of breaking off Communion, which he did, with the other Bishops that were of a contrary Opinion, as to the keeping of that Festival. If *Irenaeus* himself presented those Letters in the name of the *Gallican* Synod to *Victor*, he was President of that Synod: for he writ in the name of his Brethren in *Gallia*, over whom he presided, says *Eusebius*. In the 10th year of *Commodus* he was somewhat above ninety years old, according to our Computation:

Apud Euseb. Hist. Eccl. l. 5. c. 26. Gr,

So that he might very well preside over that Synod, if it were upon no other account than the Seniority of his Consecration. 'Tis certain, that *Eusebius* joyns him with *Palmas*; who, as he confesses, presided over the Bishops of *Pontus* for the very same reason, and he acknowledges that *Irenæus* was Bishop of the Churches of *Gallia*: for he tells us that a *Writing was extant in his time of all the Bishops of Pontus, over whom Palmas, as being the oldest, presided, and of the Churches of Gallia, over whom Irenæus was Bishop.* Hitherto then that Form of Metropolitans was received, which rather denoted a priority of Placethan Jurisdiction. Some footsteps we have of this Parity, and those very apparent, down to the Council of *Nice*. The Major part of Provincial Bishops did not even then make new Bishops. But the Suffrages of all were necessary, if it were possible for them to be had; this however is certain, that the Metropolitans Vote was necessary; Perhaps the Votes of such as were silent, were supposed not necessary here, tho' not of those that opposed. But 'tis certain, that even at that time the Majority of Voices did not confer a power to determine any thing; and if 'twas the Voices of the Silent which were neglected, there was no injury done even to their Rights. For such as were Silent might justly be charged for being so, unless any one is so foolish as to interpret their Silence to be an argument of Consent.

Euseb. Hist.
Eccl. l. 5.
c. 23. Gr.

And

And indeed that power the Synods claimed to themselves of nominating a new Bishop, was, unless I am mistaken, the ancientest of all, and perhaps it arose from the mutual Compacts of the Bishops among themselves. There is no one that cou'd complain of any injustice done him by the Synod's filling up the vacant See. Not the Bishop, that's certain, because we suppose none at that time in the Chair; so that if any injustice is done, it wholly lights upon the *Presbytery*. Indeed if the *Presbyters* had chosen the *High-priest* of the Jews, there had been some pretence for the same Right to have devolved upon the Christian *Presbyteries*, that so they might have been impower'd to fill the first Seat, whenever it became vacant. But we have already shown, that in the Jewish Sanedrim, there was another College Superior to the whole *Presbytery*, viz. the *Archieratical*. 'Tis evident, that Some of this Body were duly qualified to perform all the Offices of the High-priest, in Cases of necessity: As for Instance, when bodily Indisposition or any legal Pollution hinder'd the High-priest from officiating in his Function. For in Exigences of this Nature, the Person who supplied his Place might enter into the *Sanctum Sanctorum*, whether he was a *Sagan*, or any one else belonging to the *Archieratical College*. But there was not the least trace or footstep of this Superior College in the Christian *Presbyteries*; nay not in any other Churches, upon a vacancy of the first Seat, excepting in that of *Jerusalem*. And as for the other

LXI.

The Right of substituting Bishops into the Vacant Sees belonged not to the Presbyteries, but the Bishops of the Provincial College.

Presbyteries, we have evidently shewn, that they neither had any such Power before, nor acquired a new one after the extinction of the Church of *Jerusalem*. If therefore there was no such Power in the Presbyteries as to supply the vacant Seat, we must of necessity repair to the *Episcopate*; for this new Right devolving upon them, invested them consequently with a power to provide for the succession of this new right, and made whatever was done by them pass as Authentick as if God or his Christ had done it. The Reason is plain, because they represented God and Christ, as the Principles of Unity, but so did not the Presbyters; and therefore had no share at all in this part of the Episcopat, which was referr'd to the principle of Unity, nor any Authority to oblige God and Christ, since they could not pretend to pass for visible Bishops; I mean in that signification of the Word, as 'twas properly applied to the visible Principle of Unity. Now not only St. *Cyprian*, but *Ignatius* likewise, ascribes the Institution of visible Bishops to God and Christ; and 'tis a plain case that they were elected by their Brother Collegues, at least in St. *Cyprian's* time. * *Socrates* informs us, that *Novatian* was advanced by imposition of Hands to the Episcopat, by some Bishops of the same Opinion with himself; and † *Cornelius's* Epistle to *Fabius of Antioch* more particularly teaches us, that three Bishops lay'd their Hands upon him. This is the most ancient Instance of this Custom, as far as I can remember, that is

* *Socr.*
Ecccl. Hist.
 l. 4. c.
 27. Gr.

† *Cornel.*
 apud *Euseb.*
Hist. Ecccl. 16.
 c. 43. Gr.

to be m
 Monum
 that it
 ing.
 Tradition
 the du
 of the
 which
 chose t
 So the
 by the
 ing P
 it thos
 gener
 We h
 to on
 were
 a fair
 their
 mutu
 the
 chuse
 afore
 ther
 perv
 Perf
 beca
 It
 whe
 for
 Epi
 to d
 to l
 sho
 but

to be met with in any genuin and authentic Monuments; however this hinders not but that it might have been so from the beginning. Nay, St. Cyprian attributes it to *Divine Tradition and Apostolical Observation*, that for the due celebrating of Ordinations the Bishops of the next Province met before that Congregation which wanted one to preside over them, and chose them a Bishop. Ep. LXVII. Edit. Oxon. So then if the new Bishops were not created by the Presbyteries, but by the Neighbouring Provinces, we can assign no Reason why it should not belong to the whole College in general, but especially of that Province. We have demonstrated that they were equal to one another, and consequently that none were to be excluded. Besides they maintain'd a fair Correspondence among themselves by their Communicatory Letters, which they mutually sent and received. Thus it was the comon Interest of all these Bishops to chuse a fit and proper Colleague, by whom the aforesaid Commerce might be preserved. Neither can it be pretended that here was any supervising of the Bishop in this designation of the Person, when he was first consecrated Bishop, because he was no Bishop till then.

It was a more difficult Question to resolve, whether after this Person was now Bishop, and for some irregularity to be divested of the Episcopat, his Collegues had any Authority to depose him, since they durst not presume to be Bishops of those that were truly Bishops. Now it was not in the least doubted but that his Collegues might at least not own him

XLII:
In case of
Sacrilege,
Heresy, or
Schism, no
need of
any Depo-
siting.

In these
first times
no sentence
past against
Bishops,
that
might seem
to argue a
superior
Power over
them.

him for a Brother Colleague, who by his Crimes had divested himself of the Episcopal Dignity. But then it was necessary they should be Crimes of so black a Nature, as not only to make him deserve deprivation, but which, *ipso facto*, disabled and utterly incapacitated him for performing the Function of a Bishop. For in this Case the Question was not concerning a Bishop, but one that had been so formerly, but now was not. All that was here to be done, was only to inquire into the matter of Fact. As soon as that was made appear, the Delinquent had no Episcopal Power to be deprived of, neither was there any need of a Judge formally to depose him, but only to fill his Seat which was vacant. Such a Crime as this was it to Sacrifice to Idols, for there is *no Communion between Christ and the Devil*. 1 Cor. 10. 21. and consequently he that is a partaker of the Devil's Table, cannot be a partaker of the Lord's, but much less he that is the Head of all the Communicants, and the Principle of Unity. For this Reason, even in St. Cyprian's Age, there was not the least dispute about substituting of Successors into the places of *Martialis* and *Basilides*, who had polluted themselves with the above mention'd Crime. And therefore the foolish Impostor of the Council of *Sinnessa* committed a gross mistake in making his Bishops to doubt whether they should pass Sentence upon *Marcellinus* who had polluted himself by Offering Sacrifice, because he was a Bishop of the First See. But 'tis evident the Fathers
of

of the *Cyprianic* Age never hesitated about the point, for they made no Bishops subject to another. Such a Crime too was *Herefy*; for the chief end of the *Canonical* Letters was to preserve the common *Depositum* of the Faith safe and inviolable by virtue of this Commerce. And therefore those Bishops that embraced a different Faith, had no right to the Orthodox College, or to the Commerce of *Canonical* Letters. So that there was no occasion to depose such persons, but only to supply their places as being vacant. 'Twas the same as to *Schism*, which divided such as were guilty of it from the Church, and consequently from the Sacerdotal College, and all Correspondence with it; for, according to *St Cyprian's* principles, such a person was *without*, he was an *Alien*, he was *nothing*; and therefore there needed no sentence to turn him out of the Church, or deprive him of his Office. Hitherto therefore we find no power exercised over Bishops; nay we read of no depositions of Bishops in these times for any Crimes, which did not actually take away the Episcopal Power itself; none for their immorality or ill administration of the Church, and consequently none which supposed those that deposed them, to enjoy a superior power over them. Except it were upon the account of *Faith* or *Communion*, we read of no Excommunications issued out by Bishops against any of their Brethren approved by their Collegues, altho' the secular dignity of their See was never so extraordinary. Nay, we find that the Bishops even of the

principal City, as *Victor* and *Stephen* for instance, were deservedly reprimanded, as often as they attempted any such thing, and that by the most grave and prudent Bishops of those times. In short, we read of no Impositions enforced upon particular Bishops, even by Synods, altho' they consented to them; so far are we from reading of any enforced upon them only by the majority of Synodical Suffrages. However, I am not therefore of opinion, that all Subordination, even of Bishops, is to be taken away, but much less that of Synods. I only maintain this, that whatever Rights are acquired by the consent of particular persons among themselves, ought only so long to be maintained as those Benefits continue, in consideration whereof the respective Bishops agreed to these *Pacta Conventa*: Because Fiduciary Trustees cannot depart from any rights, which are committed to their charge, unless it be upon the score of some greater advantage to the Society, wherewith they are intrusted. Otherwise, in case they betray their trust, there lies no obligation or restraint upon their Successors, why they shou'd not challenge their own rights again in the name of the Society. There was no reason why Christ should ratify in Heaven the betraying of a power bestowed by himself, or not confer the very same power upon the Successor, which the Predecessor ought not to have alienated. Nay, in truth, he had no authority to alienate it.

For

For to throw up rights that are none of
 our own, but only committed to our trust in
 anothers name, and this without any prospect
 of benefit or advantage to be got from thence,
 is an action plainly null and void of itself.
 'Tis in the power of fiduciary Trustees to
 improve the condition of the Society, where-
 with they are intrusted, but not to impair or
 make it worse. Therefore a bare Cession,
 without any prospect of bettering one's con-
 dition, is altogether invalid: nay, the case
 is the same, if the bargain happens not to be
 performed; for by that means another's right
 committed to my trust, without any Com-
 pensation made me, will be transferr'd to
 another hand, and thus I shall leave my So-
 ciety in a worse condition than I found it.
 For all Churches, before they enter'd into
 these Compacts, had a power sufficient to
 preserve themselves, which they cannot be
 said to have; if they are obliged to a depen-
 dency, and yet at the same time are without
 those advantages, which were thought great
 enough to compensate the want of this inde-
 pendency. Upon this account there is a
 failure in those Rights that were granted to
 the Church of *Rome*, in consideration of the
 City's Dignity, which was then the Me-
 tropolis of the *Roman* Empire, as we are
 taught by the Fathers of the Council of *Chal-
 cedon*. And as for the Rights she challenges
 in the name of *St Peter*, it fully appears by
 the principles we have laid down, how weak
 and ill-grounded they are, if we'll be deter-
 min'd by the opinion of the Primitive Church.

XLIII.

*The Pri-
 macy of the
 Pope, ei-
 ther from
 the City, or*

St Peter,

*none at all.
 The obliga-
 tion of Ge-*

neral Sy-

*nods none,
 till they are
 received.*

*What Pro-
 vincial Sy-*

nods, and

*how far
 they are to
 be ap-*

proved.

St.

For

St. Peter had no Primacy at all over the other Apostles when he resided at *Rome*; neither had he any one to succeed him in his Apostleship, but much less in his imaginary Primacy over the Apostles. Besides, if he had been obliged to leave a Successor behind him, it does not therefore follow, that the Church of *Rome* must have been any ways interess'd in that Succession; but rather the Church of *Jerusalem*, wherein he was first constituted an Apostle, and Member of the Apostolical College, which, as we have prov'd, belong'd to the City of *Jerusalem*. It does not appear in History, that S. Peter had any mind to renounce this Church, or if he were never so minded, that it was in his power to have done it, since by this means the duodenary number of the Apostles, which exactly answer'd the twelve Tribes of *Israel*, must have been broken. Nay, after the death of St. Peter, we find by *Eusebius*, that the other Apostles being return'd from their Travels, which they had undertaken for the propagation of Religion, were concern'd in the Consecration of *Cleopas* the Son of *Simeon*, as being Members of the Church of *Jerusalem*. Therefore our Adversaries must find us out an Equivalent elsewhere, if possibly they can, to make us some amends for the loss of this primitive Independency; for their Church has no other pretence to retain the rights that were heretofore granted her, since the true reason why they were granted her at first is long expired. It does not appear whether particular Churches made any Cession of their Right to general Synods,

Synods, now without a spontaneous giving up of this right, I see no reason (if we exclude a particular Consent) why absent Bishops should be concluded by the Decrees of any Council, let it be as numerous as it pleases. I don't here urge, what I have already demonstrated to be true, according to the principles of *St Cyprian's* Age, that no Synod has a right to determine any Bishop by the majority of its Voices. And were it practicable, yet in the most numerous Council that ever was known, there was never the Majority of Bishops actually present upon the spot. What reason then can be assign'd why the absent, who were more in number, should be concluded by the majority of the present, tho' much inferiour in that respect? Several modest *Romanists* have been aware of this, who grant there's no obligation even in the Decrees of General Councils, till they are received by all Churches. Now if any obligation lay upon us from the Councils themselves, it wou'd be unlawful for any Church to dissent from them, because that Subject sins who presumes to disobey a lawful power. Therefore since they derive all their Obligation from the Consent of particular Churches, (which they own ought to be spontaneous and free) it plainly follows, that this obligation does not proceed from any Foreign Authority, but our own voluntary motion. Therefore I don't see why those Churches, that have laid these Obligations upon themselves, should not have power to revoke 'em when they see convenient, notwithstanding the Decrees of
Ge-

General Councils first introduced them into the World; but in the Primitive times such things as General Councils were altogether unknown, and consequently cou'd have no original Rights but only such as were derivative. 'Tis true, there were Provincial Assemblies held even in these times, and perhaps ever since the first devolution of the *Jerusalem* right; for I have remarked, that all the Collegues of Provinces had a right to appoint Successors for Churches when become vacant, whether they sent their Suffrages by way of Letter, or delivered them *viva voce* in the Synod. But as I have already observed, those that were so constituted, were not then Bishops. 'Tis evident, that there were Councils held in *Easter* and *Autumn*, purely for the sake of conferring and advising together, in imitation perhaps of the *Grecian Pylagora*, and other *Pagan* Priests, but this did not in the least infringe the rights of particular Churches. And when any Controversies arose between Bishops of equal Power and Authority, who had no Judge to determine them by his Sentence, I don't see where they cou'd so properly and fitly be made up as in a Provincial Synod. Even under the † Apostles, Judges were appointed over private Christians, that their Differences might not come to the knowledge of their Enemies, and why not much rather over Bishops, whose Arcana's were more Sacred, and wou'd occasion a greater Scandal if once divulged? 'Tis certain, that Christ did not make every Bishop a Judge in his own Cause; since this wou'd

† Cor. 6.

1, 2, 3, 4.

wou'd have produc'd nothing but a repugnancy of Judgments, nor put an end to any Controversies. Therefore no inconvenience was like to ensue, if Disputes of this Nature were to be made up by the Provincial College. For to pass sentence only in those causes which related to a common and free Commerce between Bishop and Bishop, was neither judging of God or Christ, nor yet making one self a *Bishop of Bishops*. For in this case, he that breaks off the Commerce, is guilty of first violating the Unity, as not being the principle of that Unity, which he in conjunction with the rest ought religiously to keep. And therefore this College was the Guarrantee of the Publick Concord, and no reason was there to doubt, but that he who had violated the Concord, might be ejected out of the College, whose Concord he wou'd not maintain, and another be substituted into his place by the College, who wou'd observe a more peaceable Conduct. Now the Person that was substituted wou'd enjoy his Episcopat by the very same Right as his Predecessor had done, *viz.* from the College. Therefore if the Episcopat conferr'd by the College, was imputed to God and Christ, for the same Reason when it was taken away by them, it was to be imputed to the same; and if when a Bishop is created by the College, those that were under his jurisdiction ow'd him Obedience, when he was taken away, all his right to their Obedience was consequently taken away. But now in those Cases which had no manner of connexion

nexion with other Dioceses, the Bishop had no Competitor to controll him, but had the intire administration of his own Diocese, not liable to be restrained by any Appeals, which we so often meet with in the Canons of a latter date. By degrees indeed *Synods* extended their supervising Authority from things relating to the common Commerce even to the private Affairs of Dioceses, under colour of establishing an Uniformity, for which there was not the least necessity; and gave Rules and prescribed what was to be done in every Man's particular District, and this under the penalty of Ecclesiastical Censures, if any one presumed to break these Orders. I will not here take upon me to say how justly this was done: however after the Course of so many Ages, there's now Prescription and the consent of every Bishop confirm'd by an Oath added to the primary Obligations. No one doubts but these are to be duly consider'd, especially so long as the Benefits of a Synodal Commerce compensate the loss of the former rights; but not so, while the assembling of Synods is clogg'd with so many unlucky obstructions, that now we can hardly hope for them; for in this case all the Benefits expected from Synods are likewise cut off. A Man's voluntary quitting of his rights is null, when the advantages, upon the prospect of which he made this Cession, don't answer. For this reason the old Rights must return of course; as also an Authority to resume and provide for one self, when there are no Synods to regulate these matters. The same must be said of Appeals from one's own Bishop either

ther to
Convo
to the
this en
But
this di
fiastica
Reade
accor
nity,
and in
their r
the T
Mode
tive C
where
sifts;
vern
dance
confid
Episco
donat
ment
to cor
Church
alter'd
power
But 't
since
the fi
from
was se
expect
God,
pointe

ther to other Bishops, or else to Ecclesiastical Convocations, for they are directly opposite to the Primitive Rights of every Bishop. But this *en passant*.

But to what purpose, some will say, is all this discourse concerning the Origine of Ecclesiastical Government? Why, to convince my Reader of what importance these things are, according to the Reasonings of true Christianity, tho' they are looked upon to be trivial and insignificant by those, who rather take their measure of the Christian Doctrines from the Theological *Syntagms* and *Institutions* of Modern Writers, that from their true Primitive Originals. I mean chiefly two things, wherein the Soul and Life of our cause consists; the first whereof is the Episcopal Government; and the second, their independence from the Secular Magistrate. We will consider both in their turns. Indeed, if the Episcopal Authority were only a voluntary donation of the people for the better government of themselves, we had no great reason to concern our selves about any form of Church Government, since if this Form were alter'd, it wou'd proceed from the very same power, which had first given a Being to it. But 'tis evident the Case is quite different, since this alteration does not proceed from the first Institutor of this Government, but from Man, whereas the Government itself was set up by God. Men have no reason to expect the Benefits of mystical Unity from God, if they lay aside the conditions appointed by God himself, for the attaining this

XLIV.

The power of Bishops in their several Churches of much greater importance, than is commonly believed.

this mystical Unity. We have already shown, that God was pleased that the visible Unity should imitate the Mystical: Since therefore the Mystical Unity refers to a Mystical Head and Mystical Person, it necessarily follows, that the Government of that visible Society, which entitles us to partake of the Mystical Unity and Society, ought to be Monarchical. People may say what they will, but 'tis impossible to assign a perpetual excuse, that shall justify the abrogation of a Government that was instituted by God to last for ever. We have no just pretence to expect any Rewards if we neglect, and that by our own proper fault, the Means appointed by God for attaining these Rewards. Nay, we can have no hopes of a Pardon, if we impose our own Conditions upon God, that so we may attain those Benefits that are only conferr'd by him. Neither can we hope, that the Sentences of particular Churches should be confirm'd by all the rest, while some of them have revolted from that sort of Government, which is every where else received: for we have demonstrated, that all that Commerce wholly belongs to the Episcopal College, neither are there any other Collegues of Bishops, as History teaches, but Bishops. We have shown, that the Primitive Christians were in the right for believing so; for that the reason why all other Churches were obliged to confirm the Sentences of the rest, was to be deduced from God and Christ, so that they were only obliged to confirm those Sentences, which were supposed to be pronounced by them, and that

that
God a
ciples
Bisho
justly
questi
confir
true P
when
her C
shall
will
stians
cord
has r
Partic
Christ
deepe
These
a gen
Prim
endea
God
welfa
of the
wife
your
Chur
Man
vicea
lick.
Ar
of th
addr
us le
that

that no other Sentences can be imputed to God and Christ, but those of the visible principles of Unity, and consequently of the Bishops. And then their Sentences will be justly formidable, when they carry so unquestioned a Right with them, as to be confirmed by the whole College. Then true Primitive Faith and Piety will flourish; when no Church whatsoever shall issue out her Censures against the wicked, but they shall be universally dreaded. Then lastly, will the generous Charity of the first Christians towards one another return, when Concord flourishes every where, when Impiety has no Asylum to fly to, when bandying of Parties and Factions, so fatal to the repose of Christendom, shall be branded with the deepest mark of Infamy, as it justly deserves. These are Blessings, which those that have a generous Zeal for the Primitive Faith and Primitive Purity, should with their joyned endeavours labour to promote; and may God mercifully grant, that for the publick welfare of the Catholic Church, the number of them may daily increase. May they likewise become every day more numerous in your Order, - you venerable Rectors of Churches in Christ; for the more room a good Man has to exert his Talent in, the more serviceable he will certainly prove to the Publick.

And now, you most worthy Governours of the Reformed Churches, our Discourse addresses itself to you in the first place. Give us leave therefore, we humbly beseech you,

XLV.

An Exhortation to those of the Reformed Churches to restore Episcopacy.

to unbosom our thoughts to you, which nothing but our hearty concern for the publick Peace and Welfare cou'd have extorted from us. It was natural enough in the infancy of the Reformation, that too furious a Zeal for the extirpating of Ecclesiastical Tyranny, wou'd lead abundance of unwary Men into the contrary error, and make them refuse their Spiritual Governors, even what was just and absolutely necessary for the due execution of their Function. This in effect has happen'd, and you have abolished in most places the Episcopal Name, as well as Authority (which however we have shown to be derived from God himself) even when you retained the Name, because *Superintendent* signifies the same in *Latin*. I hardly believe that any thing so much obstructed the happy progress of the Reformation, which the whole Christian World so passionately longed for, as this preposterous and unhappy conduct. There were several eminent persons of the adverse Party who were entirely of the opinion that a Reformation was necessary, provided the Authority of the Reformers had been just: But they easily perceived upon what a ticklish Foundation the Body Politick must stand, if every Pragmatical Meddler, whose Zeal is too nimble-paced for his Discretion, is allow'd to usurp an Authority to himself, to which he was not lawfully called. These Irregularities made them apprehensive that nothing cou'd be so steady and secure, but that under a pretence of Reformation, it might be thrown off and laid aside.

afide. For this reason they thought it more advisable to bear these Scandals than have them so unwarrantably reformed, tho' at the same time they wou'd have assisted the Reformers with all their hearts, if they had kept themselves within due bounds, and staid for a just Authority to remove these Scandals out of their respective Territories. To inflame the suspicions of this danger, it most unluckily fell out, that several persons, who never had a legal and ordinary Call, were forced to have recourse to an extraordinary one upon this occasion. Now prudent considering Men cou'd not but be sensible, what a dangerous Gate this pretence wou'd hereafter open to evil-minded Zealots, if it were admitted without the extraordinary Arguments of an extraordinary Vocation. They foresaw how short-lived and precarious a thing Christianity wou'd be without these Bonds and Securities which other Bodies Politic require, and how nearly it threatned the dissolution of this Body, if persons upon every Chimerical pretence were permitted to invade the rights of the supreme Power, to which they had no manner of lawful Call. The famous Story of *Semiramis*, who having obtained of her Husband *Ninus*, the Administration of the Empire for one day, dispatch'd the Creditors Debtors, and kept it the remainder of her Life, was a notable instance to this purpose. They perceived, that all hopes of future Reforms were entirely cut off, if the Episcopal Power, which by the unanimous consent of all Churches, had been

received from the earliest times after the Apostles, was abrogated, and another sort of Government, built upon very uncertain reasonings out of the Scripture, substituted into its room; and this by no consent at all of the persons then in possession, but by the violence of their own Subjects. They found, that the very Novelty of this Constitution would be an eternal Argument against it, and hinder its being received with an unanimous and durable consent, since it had trampled under foot a Government, established by the prescription of so many Ages, and apparently confirmed by so long a Continuance. They foresaw, that the Successes of these Innovators would but pave the way for other bold Undertakers to innovate after them, and possess the present Governours of the Church with a fear and diffidence of their own security. They concluded, that a Government which had its rise and establishment from the outrages of its own Subjects, depended wholly upon their Courtesie, and would never be strong enough to carry on any future Reformation, in case great numbers, and those very powerful, were to be Reformed, since it was much feebler than that which had been subverted by the obstinacy of the disobedient. By this violation of the Episcopal Power, they utterly alienated the Ecclesiastics, whose Authority might have been employed most safely in Reforming the Scandals of the Church, and made them their most inveterate Enemies. And surely it was a Solecism in Politics, to disoblige so many

powerful Princes of *Germany*, that were invested with a Secular as well as Spiritual Authority: for if any of these embraced the Reformed Religion, they were turn'd out of their Sees, as *Hermannus* Archbishop of *Colen*, and one of the *Electors*, found by experience. This was not all, they had nothing given to compensate the loss of what they had parted with, but were degraded and made ignoble, and set upon the same level with the Common Ordinary Ministers. I need not tell you how cold and indifferent, nay, how backward and averse to any thoughts of a Reformation, this must needs make these persons, whose Authority ought to have had the greatest Sway in the affair of Reforming Religion. I will only maintain, what Pious and Candid Judges (such as I now appeal to) I know will readily grant to be of the highest concern, that so many barefaced Sacrileges committed on the Revenues of the Church, which were not only permitted in order to gratifie the avarice of Princes, but in some manner approved and justified, did, in all probability, draw after them Gods severe displeasure; but especially the Sacrilegious Usurpation of the Ecclesiastical Power, which is the most Sacred of all Rights belonging to the Church, and the total extirpation of the highest Order of the Church. All this cou'd not but highly incense God and Christ, the Avengers of Episcopal Authority, as both *Ignatius* and *Cyprian* inform us: We ought not therefore to wonder, if the success did not answer expectation, and the Reformers Interest, instead

of getting ground, and making a farther progress, declines daily, and is now upon the brink of ruin. For which reason I conjure you all, who are desirous of Primitive Peace and Primitive Discipline, to return to the place from whence you fell, to the place where you stood when you enjoy'd that Peace and Discipline; in short, to the place where you were, when your condition was happiest. Be not ashamed to return to a better State, but rather give an example to those, whom you your selves shoud to reform themselves. You that can see the Beam in another's Eye, be pleas'd to take the Mote out of your own. Let it never be said, that it has happen'd through any fault of yours, that the Catholick Church is not restored to its ancient Concord, together with the ancient Conditions of Peace. Remove that Scandal which has been an Eye-sore to so many Pious and Prudent Men. Let not only your Reasons for reforming be just; but let the Authority of your Reformers be likewise so too. Restore the Rights of the Episcopal Order; thus you shall make God and Christ your Friends, who were before your Enemies. Then we shall have occasion to hope, that all those persons will cordially embrace the Interell of the Reformation, who wished the want of that, and chiefly of that, in your Churches before. Neither will you want the imposition of hands by Presbyters, which you think sufficient of itself to a lawful Vocation, when you live under the happy administration of Bishops; neither will

the A
ing,
nec
yiel
this
part
T
fo m
they
they
that
ly
ple
we
we
ack
Bil
ed
fio
dis
W
th
po
Pr
la
ve
P
C
e
I
a
r
C

the Authority of the Supreme Order be wanting, which almost all but you believe to be necessary. Why then do you hesitate to yield to the opinions of the Major Party in this Affair, when at this same time you don't part with your own?

This alteration in you the Romanists ought to much the more readily to allow, because if they have not extinguish'd the Order itself, yet they have at least ruined the Primitive Rights that belonged to it. For this they effectually do, who set up the Pope for the Principle of Unity above all other Bishops. Now we have seen that the Primitive Church, which we believe ought to be a Pattern to the rest, acknowledged no such thing as a *Bishop of Bishops*. We have seen, that if any one talked after this manner, or gave others an occasion to draw any such consequence from his discourse, how absurd and unthinking a Wretch they took him for. We have seen, that those who opposed this monstrous Hypothesis, argued upon sound and received Principles, and grounded themselves upon lawful and established Conclusions, because the very name of the *Episcopate* implies a Supreme Power, immediately next to that of God and Christ. We have seen how the Primitive Fathers never spared the Bishops of Rome, whenever they imposed any other Conditions upon Foreign Bishops, than the Common Faith and Concord, which was so necessary for maintaining the Commerce of Canonical Letters. St Cyprian particularly commends Cornelius, because he did not listen to the Stories

XLVI.

*The Pretensions of
Papal See
directly opposite to
the Primitive Rights
of Bishops.*

ries of his Schismatical *Africans*. Nay, even after St *Cyprian's* time, the *African* Fathers condemn'd all Foreign Appeals in the fourth Century. What occasion is there then for that Jurisdiction, which the Learned Monsieur *du Pin* grants the Pope, at least as he is the beginning of Unity? Nothing can be plainer, than that according to the Principles of St. *Cyprian's* Age, every Bishop is to be looked upon as the beginning of Unity, no less than he of *Rome*. 'Tis likewise as certain, that whatever St. *Peter's* pretended Superiority over the Apostles was, yet he had none at *Rome*, for he did not come thither, till St *James* was actually set over the Church of *Jerusalem*, and consequently over himself. Now, 'tis as certain, that St *Peter* had none of the *Jerusalem* Apostles at *Rome*, over whom he could exercise this pre-eminence. 'Tis possible, indeed, that he, who perhaps presided over the Apostles formerly, might preside afterwards at *Rome*; but then, as I observed just now, he had no Apostles there to preside over. And therefore 'tis downright folly to think to prove from thence, that *Rome* has any right to be reckon'd the first of the Apostolical Sees, much less that any Bishop was Superiour to the Apostles, or to the Bishops who succeeded the Apostles. But St *Cyprian*, they'll tell you, confesses, that the *Sacerdotal* Unity had its beginning in *Rome*. 'Tis true, this he might confess of his own Country of *Afric*, altho' this Commendation did not at all belong to the Chair of St. *Peter*, but not of the other Christian Provinces: for 'tis highly probable, that

that the *Africans* were converted by the *Romans*, and together with the Faith received their Bishops from them, whom St Cyprian always owns to be next to Christ. What Superiority therefore cou'd the Bishops of *Rome* challenge over the *African* Bishop, according to the Doctrine of that Age when St Cyprian flourish'd? Why, to decide all *African* Affairs in *Afric*, at least by his Legates, and by the *African* Canons: Well, but the Principles of St Cyprian's Age don't allow the Pope so much Authority as this comes to. For no Appeals from Bishops were allowed in *Afric*; where it was decreed unlawful for one Bishop to judge another Bishop's Actions; since that was altogether as enormous as to judge God and his *Christ*, and wou'd be reckon'd an insupportable Tyranny in the Church; since St Cyprian himself, who was the Metropolitan of the first Seat, denied this Power to an *African* Synod, and to the Metropolitan of a *Proconsular* Province; and lastly, since they abominated the Titles of the *first Seats*, which savoured of the least Secular Arrogance, I mean such as denoted any power over their Collegues, like that of the Supreme Temporal Magistrate over those that are Subordinate to him. I wou'd fain know how any Judgments cou'd pass upon particular Bishops, according to the Canons, when as yet there were no Canons in private Dioceses, which challenged a Superiour Authority to that of the Diocesan himself? I own, that the Bishop of *Rome* might have the place of *Primate* assign'd him, even in the *African* Synods, and consequently

sequently in those very Causes, wherein we have acknowledged the Power of a Synod to be greater than that of private Bishops, and this Construction wou'd I make of those suspected words foisted into the *Nicene Canon* by the *Romans*, viz. *The Church of Rome had always the Primacy*. But then 'tis evident, that the Bishop of *Rome* obtained that Right by the consent of the *African Churches*, which after all, was not greater than that of the other *Primates of Afric*. The word *Primate* was originally of *African* growth, and I believe hardly used any where else in those times; and therefore it is not to be stretched so far as to signify a greater power, than it did in *Afric*. Now I think we have fully demonstrated, that even *St Cyprian* himself, who was the Chief Primate of all the *African* Provinces, did not pretend to challenge to himself any power over his Collegues. Besides, this was not peculiar to *Afric*, but agreeable to the reasonings of the whole *Primitive Church*. And therefore, if the *Romanists* will speak out the truth freely, they must own, that this our Parity of all the Episcopal Rights, is much more Consistent to the *Primitive Church*, than that extravagant Power of the Pope, which they so obstinately defend. I cou'd wish that those of better Tempers among them, wou'd remember the warm Disputes that happen'd about the *Jus divinum* of Episcopacy, even in the Council of *Trent* itself.

If

If what we have deduced from the reason-
 ings of the Primitive Church be true, we shall
 at least gain this point of the *Romanists*, unless
 I am mistaken, that the boasted *Primacy* of
 the Pope, which they so obstinately main-
 tain, is no *Article of Faith*; nay, that it is
 not to be number'd among the Non-written
 Traditions of the *Apostles*, since it was not set
 up till a long while after their Death. We
 have already shown, that there can be no
 Catholick Faith, which is not likewise Apo-
 stolical; for the Catholick Faith belonged
 to the Catholick Church, which we have
 proved to be the Original and Celestial
 Church, and not to any Visible Church,
 any farther than it agreed with the Original
 and Celestial one. Now we have proved,
 that the Original and Celestial Church was
 that of the *Apostles*, upon whose Foundation
 those ought to be built, who *desire to grow into a*
Holy Temple in the Lord. *Eph. 2. 20, 21.* But
 there were in the degenerate Ages that fol-
 low'd afterwards, Revelations, as well as Mi-
 racles the Witnesses of Revelation, if we will
 believe the *Roman* Writers. But we don't
 matter these Revelations, while we at least
 preserve the *Apostles* Catholick Faith intire
 and inviolate; that is to say, while we believe
 all those things to be true, which the *Apostles*
 delivered. Neither are those persons to be
 accounted Heretics, who don't believe the
 Revelations of After-ages, which have no affi-
 nity at all with *the Faith that was deliver'd to*
the Saints. *Jude v. 3.* We therefore intreat
 and beseech them in the Lord, that they wou'd
 lay

XLVII.

*To certain
 this Pri-
 macy is no
 Article of
 Faith.*

lay aside all prepossession for these Revelations of the following times, if they wou'd be thought Competent Judges of that Faith, which was truly Apostolical.

XLVIII. But altho' this *Primacy* is no Article of Faith, yet we wou'd not deny what properly belongs to it, cou'd it be made substantially and solidly appear, that it depended even upon humane Rights. As for us, that live in these *British* Islands, 'tis enough for us, that we both used our own Authority in re-assuming these ancient Rights, and that we have now a lawful prescription for the possession we enjoy of them. Neither, indeed, do we see any reason, if the thing were to be done over again, why we should restore this Primacy. We have plainly seen by the example of the Church of *Jerusalem*, upon how slippery a bottom the whole Christian Interest stood, while all other Churches in the World depended upon that single one. For when that was overwhelmed, all the rest had fallen of course, in case our Salvation had been confined to that Church; unless by a new devolution of that Right, Matters had been so brought about, that for the time to come every particular Church was invested with a sufficient power to regulate and govern itself. But it wou'd not have been so, if it had been a received Article of Faith, that all other Churches ought to be Subject to that of *Jerusalem*; for then our Faith itself had been in danger, when that Church was now Extinct, to which all the rest ow'd obedience. 'Tis certain, that the Unity of the Catholic Church

XLVIII.
That Unity
of the Ca-
tholick
Church ve-
ry uncer-
tain, which
depends up-
on the
Bishop of
one Church,
as Head
of all the
rest.

Church
when
no lo
prom
the S
quite
ing
yet
inter
tion.
man
their
The
shall
16.
that
Chu
fal
inst
sing
wh
sha
Ch
for
pu
inc
Pr
M
de
fa
sh
in
di
in
G
yb

Church must have been utterly destroy'd, when the Principle of that Catholic Unity no longer existed. But the Apostles no where promise any such thing, as the perpetuity of the See of *Jerusalem*; nay, they foretold the quite contrary. And just upon the approaching of that destruction, the Apostles were yet alive to inform their people what God intended to do upon so surprizing a Revolution. Neither of these two things can the *Romanists* pretend to say for themselves, in case their Church had met the same Calamity. They tell us indeed, that *the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against the Church*. *S. Matth.* 16. 18. And yet at the same time pretend, that it is built upon the rock of the *Roman* Church: But if any such casualty should befall them, they don't expect any Apostles to instruct them, what is to be done in so pressing an exigence. Come then, let 'em shew what security they have, that the like ill Fate shall not destroy the whole Fabric of their Church. Alas! they have none to shew. As for that sort of Unity they now enjoy, 'tis purely owing to the City of *Rome's* being an independant City, and subject to no earthly Prince, but the Pope. Did it own any other Master, all that Catholic Unity, which is derived from the Unity of that Bishop, must fall of course. For suppose any Infidel Prince should make himself Master of this City, or indeed a Christian, but one that was of a different Communion from the Pope, can we imagine that the Princes of the *Papal* persuasion, wou'd suffer that frequent Commerce

of

of their Subjects with the Pope, or such vast Treasures to be exported into the Enemy's Country, on purpose to make this Pontiff rich, who when he was stript of his Wealth, wou'd only serve to enrich the Enemy? And yet should they do otherwise, they wou'd exclude both themselves and their Subjects from the Unity of the Catholick Church, if it were true, that this Unity depended upon the Power and Government of the Church of *Rome*, as its Head. And thus we see, that the Catholic Church wou'd be utterly extinguished, which cou'd not subsist without that so uncertain Unity of its Head; I mean, when the Body was separated from the Head. For this reason the *Muscovites*, tho' without any hostile intention, renounced all obedience to the Patriarch of *Constantinople*, from whom they received their Christianity, when they saw the *Turk* had him under his Power. Neither wou'd the Case have been much better, if even a Prince of the Pope's own Communion had Conquer'd *Rome*: for except that single Prince, none of the rest wou'd have own'd him for their Common Father, who was a downright Slave and Vassal to another. In short, so very slippery and precarious is this Principle of Unity, that unless we suppose, that the Prince, who resided at *Rome*, had either a Sovereign Power over the rest, or that the City of *Rome* will acknowledge no other Prince but the Pope; all this boasted Unity of the Catholic Church must tumble down to the ground. And now, what considering Man can believe, that a Unity built upon so

Sandy

Sandy
and h
nexed
tropo
Prece
they
were
own
the I
calls
Rome
to the
in hi
kept
this
as the
pose
himf
ted
free
ligio
this
now
have
of R
mac
Avig
Rome
and
othe
pire
had
to i
at a
from

Sandy a Foundation, ever came from Christ and his Apostles? Or, who can think it annexed to *Rome*, since the *Jews* and their Metropolitan City of *Jerusalem* had carried the Precedence even in the new *Peculium*, if they had not fallen from their Privileges, that were destin'd for them, meerly through their own Fault? Neither will the *Auferibility* of the Pope solve this difficulty, for so *Gerson* calls the *Translation* of the Papal Seat from *Rome* to any other City, conforming himself to the barbarous Language of the School-men in his Age. We own indeed, that the Pope kept his Seat for some time at *Avignon*; but this *Translation* cou'd only continue so long, as there was no lawful Bishop at *Rome*. Suppose we therefore, that the Prince, who made himself Master of *Rome*, wou'd have permitted all his Subjects inhabiting that City, a free use of Bishops, and of the Christian Religion, the consequence wou'd have been this: He that had been set up at *Avignon*, now the See of *Rome* was full, might indeed have been called Bishop of *Avignon*, but not of *Rome*: The reasons for the Pontifical Primacy, having nothing to do with the Seat of *Avignon*, but that of *Rome*; in which place the *Romanists* give out, that *S. Peter* held his Chair, and not in the former. Besides, there was no other Metropolitan City of the whole Empire, but *Rome*. And thus the Head at *Rome* had been separated from the Body belonging to it; and at *Avignon* there had been no Head at all, but only a part of the Body separated from the Head. Now can any Man of Sense be-

believe that our Saviour, or even the Apostles, wou'd have made no better a Provision for the Churches security ?

XLIX. *The Parity of Bishops more for the publick Good of the Church, than if the Bishop of Rome had been the only Heir of the Bishop of Jerusalem.* 'Tis plain, that this Devolution of the *Jerusalem* right upon the *Proper Descent* of the several Churches, was infinitely more advantageous to the Church in general, than if its whole power had fallen upon the Bishop of any one particular Church, as the *Romanists* pretend. We have already observ'd, that the former Scheme is much better calculated for bearing of Persecutions, which our Lord both promised and foretold to his Disciples. Indeed, if there were no such turns and revolutions in Humane Affairs, as we daily see, I confess we should have no reason to doubt, but the larger the Jurisdiction of a good Bishop was, that the Benefits arising from his Administration, wou'd be so much the more extended. But who dares engage his Word, that in any one See, there shall be a perpetual Succession of good Men ? On the other hand, we are to consider, that if an immoral or vicious person should happen to be Master of a very large Dominion, the ill Influences of his Example and Practices will spread so much the farther, and that 'tis in the power of a bad Successor to confound and annihilate all the good things, which several good Predecessors have established before him. Thus the danger is more universal, and consequently greater, then all imaginary advantages can pretend to compensate. Besides, we are to reflect, that no external Force is annex'd to the Episcopal Power ; but that there are many

ny forces, which by persecutions may hinder it, and so much the more, as the Bishop has a larger Territory that may be seized by more Princes: Besides, that it is in the Power of Secular Princes to hinder the frequent Concourse of People from very remote places, which, however, is absolutely necessary for the exercise of Government. Therefore the larger District any Bishop has, the more difficult matter will he find it to govern it, if Princes think fit to oppose him. But to me 'tis plain, that Christ intrusted the Bishops with such a Power, as notwithstanding the outrage of Persecutions, and the opposition of Princes, should still go on, and defend the Flock committed to their care. For which reason lesser Districts are more advantageous to the Interest of Christianity, which require no such great Cession from one's right to govern them well. Otherwise, if those of the lowest rank must not stir a step, till they receive the Orders of their Superiors, who are at so great a distance from them, so soon as ever this Commerce is shut up, the respective Bishops will want power to provide for the welfare of their Flock; which certainly is a greater inconvenience than can be made amends for, by never so great advantages from the Commerce of a distant Government: for as the advantages of a distant Government are less, so the dangers are much greater. And therefore, there is the less reason why any one should part with ancient rights upon the score of these Compacts, which require a Cession

Q

of

of more Rights in a remote, than in a neighbouring Government. But the Primitive Christians acted more wisely, the greatest part of whose Councils were concluded within the limits of the Provinces where they met. Even the largest of them did not exceed the Compass of a few Provinces, and those all in the Neighbourhood, and no Bishop then pretended to exercise Authority over his Brother Bishops, And yet we find that Heresies were suppressed by the Suffrages of these Bishops, who agreed then much better, than after General Councils were midwiv'd into the World. Thus there was no necessity to recede from that parity, which was then received by the Bishops.

L.
Princes
have no
right over
the Bishops
in Spiritu-
als.

I come now to the Second Head, of which I promised to discourse, viz. of the *Independence* of the Bishops from the Secular Power. As for the matter of Fact, 'tis undeniable, that in these Primitive Times, when the blackest Malice cou'd not condemn their Behaviour to the Magistrate, the Bishops exercised an Authority over the Christians that were subject to them, notwithstanding the Magistrate used his utmost Efforts to oppose it. 'Tis likewise certain, that there were several Districts of Cities, with the Suburban Regions belonging to them, all which acknowledged the same Bishops, altho' they were not granted to the Christians by the Emperors, or the Magistrates of the places, where these Assemblies were celebrated. This was the reason, why actions were prefer'd against them

by

by the Laws concerning *Factions*, *Sodalities*, and *Hetaria*. From hence 'tis evident, that they were visible Bodies, altho' consociated by the hope of invisible Rewards, and distinguish'd from each other by visible Limits, before they had obtained the consent of the Secular Magistrate. It appears also by History, that the Christians who lived in these times, defended these Rights of visible Churches, and likewise of visible Districts, and that they thought themselves obliged in Conscience to defend them, because God himself gave them those Rights, and not the Magistrate. 'Tis beyond all dispute, that *Constantine* found the Church in the actual possession of these Rights, and the Principles upon which these Rights were founded, we have already shewn to be of that Nature, that the Magistrate could never be a partaker of them. God indeed was the Author of them, as we have proved, who can lessen the Rights of the Magistrates whenever he sees fit, or confer the same Rights upon others, but for a different end than he granted them to the Magistrate. Now all this Right depends upon the Benefits accruing from the Ecclesiastical Society; the Establishment whereof is grounded upon this, that whoever refuses to be admitted into it, or behaves himself refractorily to the common Government of the Society, ought to go without the Benefits that otherwise he might expect from that Society. But now the Benefits of an Ecclesiastical Society are infinitely

nitely greater than what any Magistrate upon Earth can pretend to bestow. As for instance, he cannot admit one into the Heavenly Catholick Church; nor has our Lord, the Invisible Bishop, resign'd his Charge to him, nor yet engaged to ratifie in Heaven what he shall do upon Earth. He has no where conferr'd so much as the Divine Name of Bishop upon the Magistrate, to intimate that the Magistrate's Actions, as he is a Bishop, concern him. And therefore the Civil Magistrate, who has no Commerce with the Heavenly Church, has no Authority to oblige other Churches without his Dominions, to ratifie any Sentences that pass in his own Territory; and yet we have shewn, that the Bishops of Churches are invested with this Power, by which means the Rebels of particular Churches are driven out of the Communion of all the rest. Indeed, were it not so, the Ecclesiastical Censures, instead of being dreaded, would be the most contemptible things in Nature. To this purpose we may cite those Admonitions of St. Cyprian concerning the last Judgment of the Bishops, which was only obnoxious to Christ and his Father; which he urges to prove, not only that there was no Judge above the Bishop in his own Church, but also that the Divine Indignation was to be feared, if any one resisted the Judgment of the Bishop in Matters committed to his Trust. *Saul* and *Uzzias* were dreadful Instances of this Truth, when they intermeddled in Sacerdotal Affairs; and indeed all the abovementioned

tioned Arguments which I produced, still suppose that the *Bishop* is the *High-Priest*. As for the Objection commonly brought to prove the contrary, viz. that of *Abiathar's* being turned out of the High-priesthood by *Solomon*, I will not give my self the unnecessary pains to refute it here, that Affair having been fully cleared by our Brethren in some *English* Treatises, where this whole Controversie is stated and decided. And as for what relates to Right and to Conscience, that Argument of *St. Cyprian* in the Case of Secular Princes, must be allow'd to proceed *a fortiori*, for he denies that Bishops can be judged even by any of their own Collegues, at least in the abovemention'd Cases, altho' he had granted before, that the latter represented God and Christ, and we have prov'd them to be Judges of their Collegues, but not as they were the chief. Upon these Grounds not only the more Modern Assertors of the Papal Tyranny among the *Latins*, acknowledge Bishops to be Superior to Princes, but even the *Greeks*, among whom we find no such Violators of the Secular Rights, and whose Bishops could restrain their Princes with no other Terroure, than the Reverence that was due to Religion and their own Office. Thus *St. Ambrose* turn'd *Theodosius* the elder out of the Chancel, because it was not the Purple that made a Priest, having nothing to support him but the Awe of the next World and of the Gospel. Thus the most ancient Author of the Testaments of the Patriarchs, who was older than *Origen*, and flourished

*Test. *Jud.*
N.21. Edit.
Oxon.
† *Philo de.*
Gig. p. 830.
832. *de*
Monarch.
p. 819.
|| *Josephus*
Ant. Jud.
l. 4. c. 4.

rished in these first Ages we are discoursing of, * prefers the Sacerdotal, to the Imperial Dignity. Thus do the *Jews* themselves, † *Philo* and || *Josephus*, from whom this Opinion descended to the Christians. But tho' this Truth was supported by no Writers, yet plain unassisted Reason wou'd prove it; for surely no Man, who knows what true Religion is, can doubt, that the good of Souls is to be preferr'd to that of Bodies. As for that Power in Heaven, which obliges God and Christ either to open or shut Heaven, according to the Judgment given by the Bishop, Who that impartially considers it, but must confess, that it is to be preferr'd to a thousand Empires? We have already shewn, that it reaches much farther than any one Secular Dominion, since the Baptism even of a particular Church gives a Man a Right of Admission into all the Churches of the Universe and their Communion. No Temporal Prince whatever can pretend to do any such thing without his own Territories. Therefore since the Magistrate has no Right over the Spiritual Things wherein the Ecclesiastical Power is concern'd, it follows, that he can neither give nor take away the Power of administering them. From whence we may likewise draw this consequence, that notwithstanding the Magistrate turns a Bishop out of his See, the Right of the latter in Heaven continues still untouch'd as much as ever; and the Reason is, because the Magistrate can pretend no manner of Right whereby Christ is

in

in the least obliged to ratifie in Heaven what he has done upon Earth. Nay, all that Right, whereby the Consciences of Subjects are obliged, proceeds from Christ, and not from the Magistrate. Therefore if Christ still acknowledges the Bishop, this Act of the Magistrate is void and null, and in no wise obligatory to the Conscience. In like manner that Person sins against Christ the Invisible Bishop, who refuses to pay due Obedience to the Visible Bishop, who still represents the Person of Christ, and he ought so far to fear the Revenger and Asserter of all Visible Lawful Bishops, as if the Magistrate had done nothing against him. After the same manner will he be turned out of the Heavenly and Original Church, if he suffers himself to be turned out of the Terrestrial Communion of the Bishop; for by this means he will lose his Right to the Communion of all other Visible Churches, as being destitute of the *Communicatory Letters* of his Bishop. And therefore, without wronging our Consciences, we dare not part from the Communion of our Bishops, who were ejected out of their Sees by the Secular Power. For the Magistrate cannot absolve us from the Obligation whereby we are bound to our Bishops; but much less dare we own Altars directly opposite to theirs, nor acknowledge those of the adverse Party, now in possession of their Thrones, to be Bishops, who, according to St. Cyprian's Doctrine, are profane, Aliens from Christ, and consequently have no Power in the Celestial and Original Church. Those

likewise are as deeply involved in the same Schism, who consecrated those Schismatical Bishops, or who communicate with them or their Consecrators ; for St. Cyprian's Collegues voted all such to be Aliens from Christian Communion, in the Case of *Novatian*. These Fathers excommunicated *Martian* Bishop of *Arles*, because he had communicated with *Novatian*, and had proceeded with the same severity against *Fabius* of *Antioch*, in case he had persever'd in the Schism. This sad and unhappy Necessity is the reason why we dare not communicate with our Fathers and Brethren formerly most beloved in Christ. May God of his infinite Mercy grant, that without any wrong to the publick Welfare and Tranquility, we may return to Concord as soon as may be.

LI. Thus we have shewn, that Secular Princes have no manner of Right over the Power of the Bishops. We our selves wou'd not refuse to comply with their injurious Proceedings, if without wronging the Salvation of our Souls, without infringing our Duty to our Church and Bishops ; and lastly, if without sacrificing our Zeal for the publick Good, and something more necessary than that, we could find any expedient of doing it ; but in the present Case, we are of Opinion, most Venerable and Pious Brethren, that they were no longer to be born either by us or you. I will not urge, that these things tend to a direct Contempt of Piety and Antiquity ; because they are slight and trivial in respect of what we have reason to apprehend, if these

There is no reason why either the Reformed, or the Romanists should ever much consider in Princes.

these first Attempts of Sacrilege go successfully on. 'Tis true, the Storm begun with us; but flatter not your selves that this Violence of the Laity will stop short at us, and proceed no further. Hitherto we of the Reformation have been a little too indulgent to our Princes, and too unnatural to the Church. While we had the Civil Magistrate on our side, and had nothing to fear, but from the over-grown Power of the Ecclesiasticks, we did not carry our Views far enough, nor sufficiently provide for the Security of the Church, in case any of our Princes for the future should happen to fall out with us. All the advantage we got by this immoderate as well as unpolitick running down of the Clergy was, that we divested the Churchmen of their Rights, but made the Laymen every where their Enemies, and less respectful of the Holy Order, than in Equity and Justice they ought to be. The Princes were mightily pleased with this new Accession of Power, which they got out of the Spoils of those, by whom they themselves formerly had been oppress'd. Now we ought rather to have taken the middle way, that while we were asserting to *Cesar* what was *Cesar's* due, we might not in the mean time defraud God and his Vicars of their just undoubted Rights. Indeed while this Harmony and good Affection between the Prince and his Ecclesiasticks lasted, we felt no manner of inconvenience from these Concessions; for so long as both of them thus chimed together, there was danger of their quarrelling; and this

made

made the succeeding Churchmen espouse the Errors of their Successors, tho' prejudicial to their own Rights, with all the Alacrity in the World, as if the Scene would never change. Upon this the Laity growing still bolder and more encroaching, began with more confidence and safety to exercise that Malice against the Ecclesiasticks, which they had so long harbour'd in their Breasts, and what was the most monstrous part of the Farce, Churchmen themselves were the Advisers of this ill Usage of their Brethren, and betray'd their own Rights for fear of the Storm which hourly threatned them from the Lay quarter. This made them more luke-warm and backward in the defence of their own Rights, while the Laymen were unanimous to oppose them, and the treachery of some Churchmen made the rest of their Brethren more divided among themselves, and more irresolute to carry on their common Interest. The Revenues of the Church follow'd this external Force; and the more corrupt part of the Ecclesiasticks, which in most Bodies of Men make up the Majority, most obsequiously follow'd the alluring Scent of Mammon. On the other hand, the Cause of the Churchmen was weakned, not only by their being ignorant of their own Rights, but also of the Obligation they lay under to assert the Rights they were intrusted with, in the Name of the Society over which they presided, while they measured their Obligations rather by common Opinion than Primitive Originals. Besides, the Luke-warmness both of the Laics and

and Ecclesiastics in the Cause of Religion, not a little helped the contrary Party; for it occasion'd the former not to allow that to the Churchmen, which they themselves were convinc'd did justly and rightly belong to them, and it hinder'd the latter from engaging in any troublesome Law-suits, tho' it were to assert their own Rights and Liberties. I am sorry to be able to affirm, that the Luke-warmness of the Reformed is greater in defending their own Reformation, than the Violence of the *Romanists* to oppose it. Those Princes that embrace the Papal Religion, we find most inveterately bent to persecute us. For our parts we are not sorry that ours don't take a Pattern from them, nor exercise the same Cruelty. Let them enjoy that Worship, which is so much the less acceptable to God and *Christ*, and so much the more different from primitive Christianity, as it delights to be barbarous. If 'tis our case to depend more upon God than Men, we congratulate the Happiness of our Condition, and look upon it as an Argument of a better Cause, that we are inferiour to our Adversaries in Cruelty. What chiefly affects us is, that our Princes are a little too apt to revolt to the other side, and bestow such Emoluments and worldly Advantages upon our Adversaries, as are enough to tempt others to revolt from us likewise; neither do they manifest any Zeal to make publick Examples of those Revolters, who as yet have not laid aside the Profession of the Protestant Religion. All these things put together,

shew

shew what little reason the Reformed have to
 repose so intire a confidence in Princes. At
 the same time 'tis some comfort to us, that
 our Adversaries (if they consider Matters
 calmly) have no mighty Temptation to va-
 lue themselves much upon this score ; for no
 Man in his Senses will pretend to maintain,
 that Force is an Argument of Truth. The
 same Canon that plays for them now, may
 soon after be turn'd upon them ; and indeed
 these Revolutions are the easiest things that
 may be in absolute Monarchies. No one
 was warmer or more zealous for the Papal
 Interest than our *Henry* the Eighth, and yet
 no one was more inveterately bent against it
 afterwards than he. The King of *France* is a
 most violent Persecutor of the Protestants,
 and yet the Romanists have no great cause to
 boast much of his Sincerity and Firmness to
 their side. He behaved himself very severely
 towards some Bishops of his own Communi-
 on, Men famous for their Exemplary Piety
 and Sanctity, only for defending their own
 Rights granted to them by the Laws. Nay,
 he insulted the very Pope, for a much slight-
 er occasion than provoked our *Henry* the
 Eighth to fall out with him. Besides, the
 Popery of *France* is much more libertine and
 loose than that which is practis'd in other Po-
 pish Countries. They boast much of the
 Pragmatical Sanction, and the Liberties of
 the *Gallican Church*, which leave the Pope but
 a moderate share of Power in *France*, as of-
 ten as the Kings there, being provoked by the
 Pope, come to angry Words. Nay, they
 have

have talked more than once of setting up a Patriarch in *France*, when it was fear'd it would come to an open Rupture between the King and the Pope. To this purpose we may call to mind the famous Decrees of the Faculties of the *Sorbonne*, who are maintained at the King's charges for this end, to be let loose upon the Popes, whenever they begin to be refractory. But the most important Dispute of all is, that which they have with the Court of *Rome* concerning the last Judge of Controversies. The Parasites of the Papacy place the Pope above all Councils, making him alone Infallible in his Chair, and General Councils no otherwise than as they are approved by him. Nay, they account the contrary Doctrine to be down-right Heresie, which however is defended by the *French*, by many *Germans* and others, who follow the Councils of *Siena*, *Pisa*, *Constance*, and *Basil*. Therefore it necessarily follows, that they are Heretics to one another, who are in turns damned by that Judge which the other part looks upon to be Supreme and Infallible. Neither do I see how, according to their own Principles, they can communicate with one another, who are Heretics to one another, and condemned of Heresie by the chief Judge of Controversies; and therefore in strictness of Language the *French* rather make up one Faction than Communion with the *Italians*. There only wants an opportunity to break this Faction, which is join'd together by no Tie of Principles. But who can engage how long the Faction will hinder them

them from returning to their Principles ? Even under this Prince, as merciless a Persecutor as he has been, the *Gallican* Clergy maintain'd some Propositions that were very ungrateful to the Pope. Neither did they revoke them before the King, the Author of these Propositions, commanded them to retract them. This shews, with a witness, how dependant and precarious this very Clergy is in Matters of Religion, if compared to the King, notwithstanding they boast so loudly of maintaining their Liberties against the Papal Usurpations. No Man of Sense will offer to say that these Propositions, from true ones, could become false, merely because it was the Prince's pleasure it should be so. Neither can we suppose, that the Clergy alter'd their Opinion of these Propositions for no other Argument, but because the King thought fit to revoke them. If then these Propositions were false, I desire to be inform'd, why they were ever employ'd against the Popes ? and, if true, why were they afterwards revoked ? But why upon the King's commanding it to be so, if the King owns his Clergy to be the proper Judges of Religious Controversies ? This he ought to have done, if he had been a true Friend of the Church, and of Religion in general.

LII.
It plainly
tends to
the Destruction of the
Church, to
allow Princes a power
to deprive
the Bishops
of their
Spiritual
Office.

Thus we see, that tho' it were never so lawful, yet in point of discretion and safety no Laymen are to be intrusted with the Rights of the Church ; but especially those, which if they are ill administer'd, must be of pernicious

ous and fatal consequence to the common cause of Religion; and of that nature are those Rights, of which we have been discouraging. As for the Spiritual Goods of the Church, God did not annex them to any particular Sect of Christianity, but to its politick Body, I mean, not to the Faith of Christians, but to the Society. *We are Baptised into one Body*, 1 Cor. 12. 13. And the Eucharistical Bread which we break, is it not the Communion of the Body of Christ? *For we being many are one Bread and one Body: For we are all partakers of that one Bread*, 1 Cor. 10. 16, 17. Now the Body of the Lord is the Church, Col. 1. 24. 1 Cor. 12. 27. The Sacraments are the Bonds of this Political Body; so then if that is once dissolved, it necessarily follows, that all the benefits of Christianity must be destroy'd together with it. There will then be no longer any Body of Christ for us to be united to here upon Earth, and which by our Union with it may make us Partakers of the Celestial and Original Church, and of the Celestial Rights of that Celestial Church. We can have no Union with the invisible Church, but through the visible one, neither with the invisible Bishop, God and his Christ, but by the visible Bishop, and him lawfully ordained; for the invisible Bishop in Heaven will not ratify the Acts of any other Bishop, nor indeed of any one but a Bishop. If therefore we have any regard for our own Salvation, we ought to defend and stand by this Body with our joynt endeavours. Our concern for the Publick Good,

for

for the Faith once deliver'd to the Saints, in short, for Piety and Discipline, demand this at our Hands. The security of all these depends upon the Body politick of the Church, and upon the Governors of this Body, and upon the obedience due to these Governors, without which they are shadows of authority, and no more. We maintain the Faith so long as Hereticks are turn'd out of Communion; and all who profess the Communion of the true Church abominate all Fellowship and Correspondence with them. But we have found, by woful experience, how uncertain and unsteddy even our Faith is, since those Persons have thrown off obedience to Bishops; upon which the Episcopal Power depends, and by the means whercof now they are destitute of the secular arm, they might be encouraged to prevent the growth of Heresies. We may say the same of Piety, that no method is so efficacious to establish it for ever, as that all truly Pious Men should be informed, that Obedience is rather due to Places and Offices than to Persons, and that they should exhort and advise others to a strict observation of these Duties. For by so doing, they will in the first place exercise their own Humility, which is the chief security of all Religion, and likewise add the Virtue of Obedience to their other Duties. By this means too they will be able to render an easier account to God, in case any thing should happen otherwise than they intended, while they did not exceed the Limits of their own Office, but paid due Obedience to their Gover-

nours

nours appointed by God. Thus will they increase the Power of the Church to the Edification of Manners that are to be reformed by the Terror of Censures, which will be greater, and more acceptable to God the Author of publick Government; than that of private Persons, be they otherwise never so pious. For the Reverence that is paid to the personal Merits of Men, as it moves within a less Compass, so it lays not so great a Restraint upon the Conscience, and at last dies with the persons: Whereas the Duties that are owing to Places, are paid by all that are subject to them, are enforced by the fear of Punishments and hope of Rewards, and enable those that hereafter enjoy them to promote good Works, and bring them to a desired end. By this means pious Men will become partakers of the good things, which the sincere and faithful Governours of Churches, being assisted with the forward Zeal of well-disposed people, shall be able to perform: So they will find God and Christ more favourable and propitious to them, whom they worship in the Visible Bishop. Lastly, By this means Discipline, which has been hitherto so much neglected, will revive and flourish, when the Punishments of the Church are dreaded as they ought to be, and Men are thoroughly inflamed with a passionate desire of obtaining its Rewards. So great advantages, and the gaining of so many Souls, are sufficient Incentives to stir up the truly Pious, to assert and promote the Authority of the Governours of the Church with their joint

R

Ende

Endeavours, altho' the Magistrate should oppose them; they being firmly resolved at the same time to violate none of the undoubted Rights of the Magistrate, according to the Principles and Example of the primitive Church: But it would destroy the Unity of the Christian Body politick, to advance and strain the Magistrate's power so high, as that he may give or take away the Episcopal Rights, and absolve their Subjects Consciences from paying to the Bishop the Obedience they owe him. For if so, we shall have no body of a Church at all whenever the Magistrate pleases, if we shall have no Governours to preside over us, or shall not be obliged to pay them Obedience, tho' God and our Consciences teach us the contrary. The Patrons of our Princes were undoubtedly of this Opinion, when the Popes of *Rome* usurped their Rights, and took upon them the power of deposing Kings and absolving their Subjects from their Oaths of Allegiance, so that the Secular Authority was not sufficient to defend it self, in case it happen'd upon any Quarrel to be attacked by the Pope. Let them therefore turn the Tables, and consider how 'tis possible for the Church to provide for it self against a persecuting Magistrate, if the Magistrate is to be invested with all her Rights. Let him therefore not challenge that to himself which belongs to another, and which when a Foreign Power usurped over his People, he thought himself very unjustly dealt with, and complained that he was despoiled of that Authority which was
 neces-

necessary to support his Dignity. And this the Magistrates wou'd certainly do, if they would be impartial Judges in Affairs not belonging to them, and if they would not do that to another, which they would not have done to themselves. Otherwise, good-night to the Communion of the whole Church, if at any time the Magistrates of every place shall think fit to prohibit it. But still 'twill be more pernicious to Christianity, if out of Fear and Cowardise we tamely throw up those Rights of the Bishop to the Magistrate, which we own do belong to him; for then knowingly and willingly we shall prefer the Fear of the Magistrate to that of God and Christ. But if we can accustom our selves so to live, what place, I beseech you, can Religion have among us, when we own a greater Fear than that can possess us with? for no one can be guilty of so base a Thought that believes the Christian Religion to be true.

It were to be wished, and 'tis the most reasonable thing in the World if were granted, that Princes, who will needs be intermeddling with Religion, would take care to acquire some competent Knowledge in Sacred Affairs; for 'tis certainly a very hard case, that Subjects should be undone and ruin'd, for no other Reason, but because they differ in Opinion from their Prince in some Matters, which they understand much better than he. By this means they would so far advantage themselves, as not to provoke God's Displeasure, who is the Revenger of all

LIII.
Princes act
against
their own
Interest
when they
offer Violence to Religion.

Oppressors, but the Patron of such as suffer unworthily. The present King of *France* owes that Popish Communion he now defends to the Institution of his Country, to which we owe the contrary. He cannot but own this to be a very unconcluding Reason. But what follows is of more importance; he owes it likewise to the Rebellion of the *Guisean* Faction, who carried on their ambitious Designs under the Mask of Religion. If the *Romanists* there, after the Example of the Primitive and of our *British Church*, had kept their Allegiance to a Prince of a different Religion, who notwithstanding had the right of Succession on his side, his Grand-Father wou'd have undoubtedly Educated his Father, and his Father him in the Reform'd Communion, and then our Adversaries wou'd not have had this mighty Patron, of whom they boast so much. We see then that this Great Monarch owes his Religion to a certain reason, which ought not to be so taking with Princes neither, *viz.* because those of the Papal Communion are more disloyal to their Sovereigns than we are. However if they wou'd but listen calmly to Reason, Princes wou'd easily be convinced that they trespass against their own real Interest, when they offer any Violence to the Religion of their Subjects, and much more to their own. Princes have any thing firm and to be depended upon in this World, 'tis the Allegiance of their Subjects confirm'd to them by an Oath. Now they that wou'd compel their People to violate their Fidelity to God,

with

with w
should
Promi
obligat
the Pa
late it f
at the
of his
truly G
by the
if the
punish
poses
Prince
that f
makes
God.
securit
the P
exact
fronts
comm
necess
than
ceases
Oaths
oblig
mann
Oblig
son, I
that
ship,
to G
prud
lay a

with what Equity can they expect that they should have a greater regard to the Vows and Promises they make to themselves? The true obligation of an Oath terminates upon this, that the Party who has taken it is afraid to violate it for fear of the Divine Vengeance, when at the same time he is not in the least afraid of his Prince. Therefore an Oath is then truly serviceable, when People are restrained by the fear of God from doing that, which if they should do, their Prince can never punish them for it. This consequently supposes that God is more to be feared than the Prince, even according to the opinion of those that swear. On the other hand, Persecution makes them more afraid of the Prince than of God. 'Tis plain then that it takes off all that security, which is then chiefly expected, when the Prince has not force enough about him to exact this Fidelity by fear. For he that affronts and despises God, as often as he is commanded by his Prince to do it, must of necessity testify a greater fear of his Prince than of God; and therefore so soon as he ceases to fear his Prince, what signify his Oaths of Fidelity and Allegiance, or what obligation is so sacred as to bind him? In like manner, if a Man neglects the Oaths and Obligations of his own Worship, what reason, I pray, have you to believe him in Oaths that are tender'd to him by a different Worship, which he thinks to be false and odious to God? 'Tis a prodigy in my mind, that any prudent Prince should be so overseen as to lay any stress upon those Oaths, or in the ex-

torted Profession of another Communion. And in this he can pretend no Zeal for the good of Souls, for the profession of the true Faith avails nothing to our Salvation, unless we firmly and cordially believe it to be so. If it were believed, there wou'd be no occasion for any Violence to oblige Men to embrace it. But indeed this method of proceeding is so far from contributing to the conversion of Souls, that on the other hand it rather introduces a contempt of all Religion; for one Prince cannot pretend any thing, but another, if he pleases, may copy from his Example; Nay, it rather provokes them to imitate him against their own inclination. And if this were put in execution, what advantage wou'd the Popish Communion reap by it? Suppose it contributed to promote Popery in *France*, it wou'd serve to abolish it in the Dominions of the Protestant Princes. And then let a Prince of the Reformed Perswasion succeed a Popish one, and he in like manner compel his Subjects to embrace his way of Worship. 'Tis possible that in the same Succession there may be various changes of several Communions. Now if all Princes did the like, the result wou'd be this, that while their Subjects professed to believe every thing as their Prince wou'd have them, they wou'd believe nothing sincerely and cordially, and at long run there cou'd be no relying upon any Oath whatever. Thus we see that 'tis highly prejudicial to Princes to offer any Violence to their Subjects Consciences in matters of Religion. For either they throw off all Honour

Honour of the Religion they have denied, and in that case retain nothing whereby their Fidelity can be assured; or else they meditate revenge in their minds for this outrage committed upon their Consciences, which may fall heavy upon the Authors that advised it, and then they will watch all opportunities to quit scores with them. Thus the Common-wealth will be exposed to the greatest danger, if any Neighbouring Prince, who espouses the quarrel of these Male-contents, should carry Fire and Sword into the Bowels of the Country; especially if he should meet with any favourable Success, to give these People an opportunity to throw off the Mask, and safely to execute what they have so long projected. But yet a Prince wou'd do greater mischief still, who relying upon a foreign force should violate and insult that very Religion which he himself professes to follow. Even his own Conscience will inform him, that he must surely expect the indignation of God, who is the Avenger of Religious Duties. As he himself is a despiser of the Deity, so others by the influence of his example cannot but be so too. For Atheists blow up the Coals upon these occasions, giving out, that Religion is nothing but a Politick Cheat, contrived on purpose to keep the Mob in awe by the fear of another World; and they are the deeper confirm'd in this opinion of theirs, when they see Religion so awkwardly managed by Princes, as if they had no regard at all to the Truths she Preaches, but to that unaccountable Terror the possesses People

with. Towards the spreading of this Atheistical Infection 'twou'd not a little contribute, if the secular Magistrate out of a vain Presumption of his own force should despise the venge of God, whom however he wou'd not have to be despised by his Subjects upon any Confidence whatever; and lastly, if he should remove the Power of Judging in Religious Affairs from Courts that are better skill'd in them, and consequently wou'd better determine the truth and bring it to his own inspection: For this wou'd give the World occasion to say, that he does not so much consider the truth of Religion, as what use and benefit may be made of it. In short, the cause of Atheism is not a little encouraged when People see the very same numerical Propositions one while approved and another while damn'd, according to the pleasure of the Prince and not of the Bishops; and lastly, when the Civil Magistrate pretends to eject the Bishops that are invested with a more noble Power by God than their own. Oaths and Promises are the firmest Supporters of all Crowns, but there is no security in an Oath if you take away Religion. And 'tis a plain Case that Princes voluntarily strip themselves of this Security, that commit any out-rages against Religion.

LIV.
*'Twou'd be
 to the com-
 mon Inter-
 est of the
 Reforma-
 tion, if the
 Bishops
 were re-
 stor'd to
 their Pri-
 mitive
 Rights.*

I heartily wish that this Consideration of the Secular Power may have that good influence on all Pious Men, and true admirers of primitive Antiquity, whether they are of the Reformed or Popish persuasion, as to excite them to the defence and maintenance of the true Religion. Let us carry our thoughts from this World to Heaven,

Heaven, and our trust from Princes to the invisible Bishop above. This is of the last importance, since the Enemies of our common Christianity, as Atheists, Deists, and the opposers of all revealed Religion, appear barefaced in publick, and threaten us with no less than the subversion of our Constitution. This will revive and invigorate our Zeal for the publick Interest of the Church, extinguish all fears of Persecution that are endur'd for a good cause, and finally make us cautious that our Adversaries may have nothing to reproach us with justly. Besides, let us seriously consider how necessary for obtaining the rewards of Righteousness, all those Duties are which we owe to the Body Politick of the Church; for 'tis certain that these rewards are not to be ascribed to the merit of our Piety, nothing of which we pretend to with respect to God, but to our Covenant with him: Now this Covenant is made with Christ and the visible Church his Body, whereof unless we are Members, all our pious Works will signify nothing towards obtaining these rewards in Heaven. How necessary is it therefore that we should acknowledge the Bishops upon Earth, in order to obtain Christ's favour in Heaven, who is the invisible Bishop and Rewarder of sincere Piety? Let every one therefore endeavour, according to the Authority he enjoys at Home, O you Reformed Patrons of true Religion and Antiquity, to restore the ancient Rights of Bishops, together with the Name, in his own respective Country. By this means the Bishops of other Churches, to whom

whom the right of such a Commerce belonged according to the practise of the Primitive Church, will have Collegues to maintain a Correspondence of Canonical Letters with. Neither do I see any reason why if this were once done, such a Commerce may not be kept up with all the Reformed Churches at least; for I don't look upon the *Socinians*, nor their favourers the *Armenians* to deserve that Name. In the rest I can perceive no fundamental Doctrines wherein they differ, I mean such as are clearly and expressly laid down in the Holy Scriptures; for 'tis the unanimous belief of the Reformed Divines at least, that only such are properly call'd Fundamentals. Now no other Doctrines but those that are Fundamental, ought to hinder us from keeping Communion with other Churches, because those and only those relate to the *Depositum*, or *thing committed to our trust*, 1 Tim. 6. 20. Neither is the Communion of Churches that are equal, and have no Authority one over another, to be broke off upon any other account. In the mean time particular Churches may prohibit within their own Districts, such Propositions as they either look upon to be dangerous or scandalous, with respect to the apprehension of the Auditors, or such as will raise unnecessary heats and tumults, and do more harm than good. For in these matters the Circumstances, which belong to the inspection of the local Governours, are often of much greater importance than the things themselves. One good effect of this Correspondence will be, that by this means the Authority

thority of every Church will be greater, even over its own Members, while the Excommunicates of particular Churches are to be received into the Communion of no other Church, without Canonical Letters under the Hands of their own Bishop, nay, not by those that have not condemn'd those Propositions by any censure of their own. After the same manner as we observed above, that in the Primitive Ages, those Bishops that receiv'd penitent Adulterers into Communion, and those that excluded them from it for ever, Communicated friendly together, and all by Virtue of that Primitive Doctrine, *viz.* that the sentence of every Bishop in his own District is to be reckon'd as the sentence of Christ, and no more to be judged by another Bishop than God himself and his Christ, least he should seem to set himself up for the Bishop's Bishop. Thus the independence of particular Churches, their various Rites and Ceremonies; and their different Doctrines provided they are not fundamental, will be no obstacles to Communion, so long as they refuse not to confirm the sentences of other Churches; which they will certainly do, if they receive no Subject of any foreign Church into their Communion without Letters Communicatory from his own Bishop. How much easier are these Primitive terms of Communion, than those which Churches of a younger date impose upon one another, without any manner of Authority? Were these steps towards a Catholick Concord once made, I doubt not but the Reformation wou'd be a considerable gainer by it.

In

In the first place, that Scandal, which, as I have already observed, has hinder'd it from making so great a progress in this latter Age, as it did in the beginning, will be removed and taken away. And secondly, it will bring over those to our Party, who were offended at nothing in the Reformation, but that it was not carried on by so Legal an Authority in the Reformers as they could have wish'd ; but especially if new Bishops are ordained by others. Besides the publick Methods concerted for propagating this Reformation, it will be supported with a just Authority ; both which we now want ; tho' we find, to our expence, that our Adversaries have them, who upon this account are superior to the Reformed. But Secular Princes hinder all such laudable Designs, being diverted by their Affluence and Luxury from carrying their Thoughts to Heaven ; so that they seldom trouble themselves about the Welfare of Souls, unless their Temporal Affairs happen to put them upon it : Now can any thing be more scandalous than to postpone Heaven to Earth ? Neither are they at all concern'd about Communion, especially without the Limits of their own Dominions. Whereas were the Bishops restored to their ancient Rights, as they readily acknowledge that Christ intrusted them with the Care of Souls, so they wou'd endeavour to give him a good account of so important a Charge. This they wou'd make their chief, and only business, nor take farther care of Temporals, than as they conduce to a Spiritual End ; which is certainly the Order

der which God himself prescribed. The Presbyters then wou'd assist the Bishop in his Diocesan Synods, his Collegues likewise abroad, with whom he maintains a Correspondence by Canonical Letters, wou'd not be wanting in their turns to help him, whose consent one single Magistrate can never be able to engage for. And now may God raise up many *SPE NIE R S*, who will diligently promote and recommend the practise of these common Doctrines, without Enthusiasm, or reviling the Superior Ecclesiasticks, without any detriment or hindrance to Communion and Brotherly Concord. May he prosper such Advancers of true Piety, and grant that all of us may be of their opinion. So shall we see a true and unblemish'd Reformation, liable to no Scandals and Exceptions, start up and revive, which shall daily make a greater Progress, and extend its Limits. And so much to our Brethren of the Reformation.

'Tis time now to apply our Discourse to the *Romanists*, whom likewise we appeal to as Arbitrators of this Controversie, who will be soon convinc'd how easie a matter it is to return to the Catholick Concord, if taking their Pattern from the Primitive Church, they agree to assert the ancient Rights of Bishops. If they govern themselves by the practise of those Ages, the Bishop of Rome will furnish them with no pretence to break off this Union; neither will his Supremacy over the Catholick Church pass for an Article of Faith, nor those be reckon'd in the Class

LV.
The restoring of these Primitive Rights of the Bishops will pave the way to an Union with the more moderate Romanists.

of

of Hereticks that don't acknowledge it. So then the only Question that remains, is concerning the Schism, whether at least this Supremacy can be maintain'd upon the foot of Ecclesiastical Humane Law? But as this Affair does not affect them, who are establish'd by Prescription in the possession of their ancient Rights, so neither does it concern such as have of themselves reassumed these aforesaid Rights into their own Hands, upon the failure of that Reason for which they were at first given up. We have already proved that they had a Right to reassume them, as soon as the Reason of their being thrown up ceas'd; and also that they were the proper Judges of the time when it fail'd. And therefore as for what concerns the Government of the Church, I see nothing that should hinder them from coming into the same College with the Reformed Bishops: Not certainly in the Judgment of those, who asserted the Divine Right of Episcopacy against the Parasites of the Papal Court, nor yet in the Opinion of those who asserted the *Gallican* Liberties against the Pope, but especially of those who think not any Concession, even of the Pope, reason sufficient why he should challenge them to himself. Indeed 'tis impossible but those must think so, who even in defiance of the Pope, believ'd it lawful to set up a Patriarch over themselves. Let them therefore allow other Provincial and National Churches their own Liberties in their turn; for why should they blame other Churches for doing that which the

Galli-

Gallican Church has threatned to do, and pretended she had Right on her side, if the Quarrel had not been made up, and a Reconciliation agreed to? This they must allow to be reasonable, if they acted sincerely in this matter, and not merely to comply with the Pleasure of their Prince. From what has been said, it undeniably follows, that as this Supremacy had its rise from Ecclesiastical Right, so it may be laid aside and abdicated by the same, and that whenever a Pope of free generous Principles thinks fit to abdicate it for his Successors, it will be for the Interest of the Catholick Church in general. At the same time I am not ignorant that there are other Doctrines *de fide*, which are given out as Reasons why the Bishops of the *Roman* Perswasion cannot come into the same Fraternity with the Reformed. All this I own to be true, if they determine their Faith by the Opinion of later Writers, I mean those of the middle and lowest Antiquity, as also if they take the Decrees of those Ages concerning the Articles of Faith to be infallible. But we have demonstrated, that the Catholick Church was the same with the Original, which was likewise the same with that of the Apostles, and consequently that the Catholick Faith is no other than that which the Apostles themselves preach'd while they were conversant here upon Earth. Now that the Innovations of the following Ages are wholly different from that, they themselves gave us all the just reason in the World to suspect, since they were forced to coin new
Reve-

Revelations, and new Miracles to recommend them to the World ; for all which there had not been the least occasion, if they had been Matters of Faith, which was sufficiently confirmed by the Miracles of the aforesaid Apostles. Nay, the Modern *Romanists* give us just occasion to suspect the same, while they derive the Evidence of their new Faith from the new Declaration of the Church, but so, that those who lived in former Ages, before the Church had lately declared it, might have safely denied it, without the least Imputation of Heresie. For Example, the Worshipping of Images and Saints can never pass for a new Declaration of an old Belief, since we find not the least Traces or Footsteps of them in those undoubted Monuments of the Primitive Church, which flourished before *Constantine*. Besides, that very Doctrine of the Primitive Parity of all Bishops, that, to instance in no more, gives a terrible blow to the Authority of the *Romanists*. And then the Word Infallibility is an Invention of the latter Schools, or at best not much ancienter. However, there is no reason why the *Romanists* should monopolize Infallibility to themselves, unless they cou'd prove that their particular Church is to be taken for the Catholick ; for they themselves will readily own, that it only belongs to the Catholick Church. But if you once take away the Primacy of the Pope as the Principle of Catholick Unity, they have nothing to offer why they should any more be called the Catholick Church than the *Greeks* have. The latter have many
more

more Churches of Apostolick Erection to boast of than they have, and may object their Agreement with them to the *Romanists*; and yet those of the Papal Party are so far from owning the *Greeks* to be infallible, that they accuse them of the grossest Errors. Therefore let them acknowledge themselves to be fallible, and then we shall easily convince them, that the Ages wherein these new Articles of Faith were hatched, are neither to be commended upon the score of their Piety nor Knowledge, in understanding the Faith formerly deliver'd, or conveying it down faithfully to Posterity. Now if in these Ages of more Experience and Learning they wou'd submit to call the Decrees of the more ignorant times to an Examination, I dare engage, that considering what vast Improvements have been made in all the several Branches of Learning, and particularly in Theology, they will think otherwise of these Matters than their ignorant Predecessors did before them, especially if they lay aside those Prejudices that are rather contracted by Custom than Judgment. So easily will the Primitive Rights of the Bishops pave a way to Catholick Concord, even among the *Romanists*, when they are once restor'd.

It will moreover concern them, if they wou'd vigorously and cordially promote the Interest of Christianity, to assert the above-mention'd Rights of Bishops, not only against the Papal Usurpations, but the Encroachments of secular Princes. The *Gallian* Clergy labours under the same inconvenience

LVI.
The Protection of the Prince no advantage even to the Roman Church, if he violates the Liberties of his own National Church; which he defends against the Pope.

nience in *France*, as we do here in *Great Britain*. Their Prince maintains and secures their Liberties against the Pope; and so far matters would go well with them, if he himself did not impose a Yoke upon them, which when any one else endeavours to lay upon their Necks, then he's for shaking it off. But the mischief on't is, that this is only a changing of the Master, and not the asserting of liberty, as 'tis commonly believ'd. Servitude can never be reconciled to liberty, let him that wou'd force it upon us pretend what he pleases. If the King wou'd be thought a sincere Patron of Liberty; let him grant his Bishops a free unrestrained Power of voting in Spiritual Matters, while they abstain from meddling with Temporals upon any pretence whatever. Let him not interfere with their Spirituals, who thinks it so prejudicial to his Crown, if Ecclesiasticks pretend to interfere with his Temporals. Let him not do any thing which he wou'd exclaim against as contrary to Ecclesiastical Liberty, if the Pope offered to do the same. Let him not impose his own Opinion in Matters of Religion. Let him not inflict any Mulcts or Punishments upon them for thinking otherwise than he does in Affairs that properly belong to their inspection, but only suffer them to be inflicted by the higher Ecclesiasticks. By this conduct he'll give the World an earnest that he believes the Religion which he professes, and gain this good Effect upon his Subjects, that they too will believe it, and by its awe keep firm to their Duty and Allegiance. Other-
wise

wife the Church will reap no manner of advantage by such a Prince's Patronage and Protection. For if the external force of the Secular Arm be opposed to the Ecclesiastical Censures of the Pope, the consequence will inevitably be this, that the fear of the Secular Magistrate must be own'd to be greater than that whereby Ecclesiastical Decrees receive their Sanction. Now if the Subjects of the Church do but once imbibe such an Opinion as this, there will be nothing left to oblige them to any one Spiritual Society and Communion, whenever the Magistrate shall think fit to persecute them. But infinitely more mischief will this Opinion do, if it should happen to find any Countenance from the Ecclesiasticks themselves, and that would appear with a witness, if they should never defend any Doctrines contrary to the Papal Censures but when the Magistrate importunes them, and should alter their Sentiments in Religion meerly at his Command and Pleasure. Now this is a greater damage to the Church than the Prince can possible compensate by his Temporary Protection of it. Otherwise, if any Usurpation were to be allow'd in Sacred Matters, that Tyranny would carry a better face with it, which was exercised by Churchmen against those of their own Function, than by Seculars. For in the former Case there is a pretence at least of some Power given by God and to be confirmed by him, although it somewhat exceeds its due bounds; nothing of which can be pretended by a Layman in Sacred Affairs. So that I

may venture to affirm, that if a Churchman exercises a Power over his Brethren, which is not warrantable by the Canons of the Church, yet he does less harm to the publick Interest thereof; for in the first place here's no Example of the Sacerdotal Sanctimony violated by a Layman; which directly terminates in unhinging the Security of all Laws, as far as the Conscience is concerned in them, in trampling upon the Security of Oaths and Promises, when Religion it self, whereon the Security of all the rest depends, is insulted: And, lastly, in undermining Religion it self, when such bad Examples are given by those who have all the external Force in their hands. Besides, it manifestly tends to the Contempt of God and his Church, if the Violaters of both escape unpunish'd, or at least seem to do so for a time, since God takes the Patronage of Religion and Sacred Matters to himself. For if there is any Providence, the world thinks it obliged to take such provision, that the punishment of wicked Men should not be retarded; for Men will be less afraid to use any Injustice in relation to their Fellow-creatures, when they see God tardy to revenge his own Cause. I do not pretend to determine with what Solidity this Argument is used, but we may find by the Canonical Author of the *Ecclesiastes* that people used to argue after the same rate in former times, *Because Sentence against an evil Work is not executed speedily, therefore the Heart of the Sons of Men is fully set in them to do Evil*, ch. i. We have no reason to doubt, but that in this degenerate Age, impious persons,

sons, who are glad of any opportunity to expose and revile our Holy Religion, support themselves in their Wickedness by such sorts of Reasonings, tho' nothing can be more absurd : For either God will punish the Violators of Sacred Things in this Life, and that very speedily, and then Princes must of necessity fear the Punishment they so justly deserve, or else he will delay and reserve it to a future Life, and then they'll have no occasion to boast of Impunity, since they are only deferr'd in order to a more terrible Punishment. However, they will even by this means lose all the Security they derive from Religion; which, after all, is the safest Fortification, and to be preferr'd to a thousand Armies : For Armies, without Fidelity, are but prejudicial to Princes ; and there's no Fidelity without Religion. But 'tis more the Concern of an Ecclesiastical Usurper to promote the common Good of Religion, since he makes it his chief and his only Business, and not subordinate to any other that has no relation to Religion. And consequently 'tis reasonable to conclude, that he is better skill'd in Sacred Matters, than one that only looks after the Salvation of Souls by the by, and has his Thoughts chiefly employ'd upon other things of a quite different nature. Such a one, tho' an Usurper, as I have said, will think it his highest commendation to see Religion flourish in publick, and besides, has a stricter Friendship with his Collegues dispers'd all over the World, by whose joint Assistance and Counsels the publick Affairs of the Church are to be administer'd ;
and,

and, lastly, who has a Right from God to oblige all his Collegues to ratifie his Acts, if he keeps himself within his proper Bounds, which no secular Prince can pretend to do. 'Tis certain, that Christianity would be in a much better condition, if Christian Princes would shew a greater regard to their own Souls than to their Life and Dignity, and consider'd, that for gaining of Souls to God, they wou'd be rewarded with a brighter Crown of Glory, than for governing their Kingdoms never so vigilantly and wisely. But 'tis no wonder that these thoughts shou'd more seldom happen to Princes than to Ecclesiasticks, who make it their principal Profession.

LVII.
*The Primitive Re-
spects pay'd
to Bishops
ought to be
inserted in-
to the mo-
dern Ca-
techisms.*

Thus, O you most grave Arbitrators, have we adventur'd to pour our Complaints into your Bosoms, not with any Intention to make you Partakers of our Sorrow; altho' perhaps your Christian Compassion may not think us unworthy of your Pity, but rather with this design, that you might take warning by our Example, and provide against the like Storm whenever it threatensto attack you. The present Juncture demands, that those who have a true Zeal for Christ, into whose Service they initiate themselves at their Baptism, shou'd attempt something Great and Heroical for his Name, to unite all the Churches upon Earth together, and fortifie themselves with united Strength against the approaching Tribulation. Since we find the Temporal Magistrate to be so uncertain and wavering, we ought to think of some expedient whereby to preserve our Churches and Communion inviolable, even with-
out

out his assistance. This we shall be able to effect, if both in our Books, our Discourses, and our Sermons, in Season and out of Season, we urge and inculcate the necessity of those Duties, which ought to be paid the Bishop, according to the received and laudable Practise of the Catholick Church; but especially if we take care to insert all things relating to this Head into our pullick Catechisms, which has been hitherto too much neglected by those of the Reformation. For these Duties are not only sufficiently important, but are of so wide an Extent, that they very well deserve to be inserted into our Catechisms. The importance of them is evident enough, since the whole power of Governours and the Cement of all Society depends upon the Obedience of those that are subject to it; which is null and insignificant, if the latter suffer themselves to be disunited from their respective Heads. The recommending and preaching up of these Duties had that good effect in the severest Persecutions of the Primitive Church, that notwithstanding all their oppositions, the Church continu'd still entire and unhurt, while all that profess'd Christianity, even Laymen as well as the rest, despised all the Terrors and Threatnings of the Secular Magistrates, and thought they ought not to be put in the same Scale with the Communion of the Bishop. Hence it appears of what importance Government is in every Society and Communion; for without that there can be no steady Discipline either with relation to Faith or Manners. And therefore if the Precepts of Faith and Manners are things

things worthy to be taught in our Catechisms, there is no doubt but the asserting of these Duties ought to have a place in the same. But were all this of no consideration, yet these Duties ought to be recommended, if it were upon no other account but that they affect every person that comes to be Catechised. There is not one Member belonging to the Church, of whatsoever Rank or Class he may be, but is obliged by these Duties, upon which the Body politick of the whole Church depends, and is preserved in its Station. Nay, to speak truly, it must depend upon the spontaneous consent of all its Members performing these Duties, whenever the Magistrate takes a contrary Course. And therefore 'tis necessary that every individual Subject of the Church should be early tinctured with these Doctrines, least the Terror of the Civil Magistrate should oversway him. Upon this account 'tis requisite that every one should be inured to this practise of Submission from his Infancy; for by this means his consent will be steddier and more constant in the day of Trial. What then have I to do but to conjure you all to employ your united Endeavours for the preservation of the Church? If every Man will do what belongs to him in his Station, we have no reason to despair but that God will bless such generous Designs that are intended for his Honour, and the Good of his Church.

6 AP 58

F I N I S.

,
-
nt
a-
on
y
is
of
ut
ch
e-
y,
n-
ng
ces
ef-
the
efe
la-
his
be
his
will
of
ure
ours
ery
Sta-
that
that
ood